DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 152 681 95 SP 011 846

AUTHOR	Reid, Lorenzo E.
TITLE	Process and Productivity in Six Urban/Rural School Development Programs: Case Studies and Comments.
INSTITUTION	Stanford Univ., Calif. Center for Educational Research at Standford.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Sep 77
NOTE	118p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$6.01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Case Studies; *Community Involvement; *Educational Administration; Elementary Secondary Education; *Interaction Process Analysis; *Organizational Effectiveness; School Community Relationship
IDENTIFIERS	Parity; *School Community Councils; Urban Rural School Development Program

ABSTRACT

Six case studies are presented of School Community Councils (SCCs) in the Urban/Rural School Development Program of the Stanford University Leadership Training Institute. The councils were organized to facilitate school improvement and development through the incorporation of both school and community input. Each SCC was composed of two numerically equal groups of people--the "education professionals" (teachers and administrators) and "community members" (a group composed of poor, disenfranchised individuals in four of the six studies, and well-to-do traditionally community active persons in the remaining two). The case studies were designed to investigate the contribution of this functional and structural parity process on the SCCs' productivity. Responses to interviews, observations by the investigators, and archival data make up the findings of the document. (EJB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED152681

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

PROCESS AND PRODUCTIVITY IN SIX URBAN/RURAL SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS: CASE STUDIES AND COMMENTS

by Lorenzo E. Reid

THE URBAN/RURAL LEADERSHIP TRAINING INSTITUTE STAFF
SEPTEMBER 1977

SP011 846

INDEX

I Preface i

II Introduction 1

III The Historical Context 4

IV About Them All (some comments) 7

V Individual Case Studies

ALPHA 1 29
ALPHA 2 44
ALPHA 3 57
ALPHA 4 72
BETA 1 89
BETA 2 100

VI Summary Conclusions 115

PREFACE

The Leadership Training Institute at Stanford University has been associated with the Urban/Rural School Development Program throughout that program's six-year history. During that period, which began in 1971, the Leadership Training Institute (LTI) had opportunities to visit the many unique Urban/Rural projects, becoming familiar with the programs and their earnest and talented personnel.

In fulfilling its responsibility for documenting the Urban/Rural (U/R) experience, the LTI utilized a variety of study techniques, one of which was the case study. Site visits were made to a selected number of U/R programs which made it possible to make observations, conduct interviews and review program documents.

The goals of the studies were to determine how the programs' basic structures were constituted, the degree to which their function followed the form of those structures and how those two variables influence outcomes. In the LTI's wider study, other methodologies were utilized to examine these same phenomena along other dimensions. That is, other researchers using other investigative instruments, shared common goals with the case study efforts.

One of the many advantages of the case study method was its capacity to involve a significant cross-section of Urban/Rural participants at the sites, all with varying degrees of centrality to their programs. Local U/R staff agreed to set up schedules and interviews which enabled the case study researchers to efficiently perform their assignments. All respondents volunteered their cooperation and were promised anonymity in the final case study document.

All of the original individual site studies are included (edited only to preserve anonymity) in a section of this document and are preceeded by background and descriptive material of general applicability and followed by a combined summary of the studies.

INTRODUCTION

The Urban/Rural Program is said to be basically an inservice training program for public school personnel. The staging of the training, however, involves a conceptual model of participatory democracy which, in spite of its somewhat radical departure from tradition, is nevertheless, disarming in the simplicity of its intent.

The concept's basic principle places the responsibility (and authority) for making educational policy decisions in the hands of those affected by them. This would involve policy making at a limited number of schools (2-5) at the federally funded local site. The vehicle for achieving this is a School-Community Council, whose balanced membership make-up must reflect the concept. School development (and improvement) is then to be pursued through programs, emanating from the School-Community Council (SCC).

The Program Information Document which contains the guidelines for U/R describes the SCC structure and function in more precise language:

> The School-Community Council shall be comprised of elected representatives from the ranks of teachers, administrators and other school staff; and the community (which will include students). The concept of parity should be reflected in the composition of the Council with at least half the membership comprising other than the school staff. That a School Community Council should be considered as an integral part of a school district. With the acceptance of an Urban/Rural School Development Program Grant, every system has accepted this option as a condition for participation in the program. The school district in accepting the Urban/Rural School Development Program has accepted an obligation to delegate such decision-making authority to the School Community Council. Authority delegated to the School Community Council does not supplant that of the school board nor the authority of state and local governments. The Councils must operate within the requirements of Federal, State and local laws. However, it is expected that local education agencies will provide to the School-Community Councils the broadest possible discretion for making decisions relating to the design and implementation of education personnel training programs for the designated schools within a project.

Once constituted, this body was to elect a chairperson, develop its own bylaws, schedule regular meetings and proceed in the fulfillment of its mission. To facilitate their activities, a portion of the grant was to be used to hire a team manager (full-time SCC executive officer) and support staff. Additionally, funds were available for space, office equipment and materials, communications, reproduction, etc. With this, the programs were set in motion with the understanding that they would be funded for 5 consecutive years. It would be six years later, during the spring of 1977, that the Stanford LTI would engage in case studies of the Urban/Rural School Development Program at six of the 25 sites.*

It was the diversity of role groups to be involved in U/R, along with the dynamics of shared decision making, which suggested inquiry into the programs through case studies. Some of the complexities and subtle nuances might be examined through the case study method which may have proven elusive for statistical description.

For illustration, this can perhaps be seen, by taking another glance at a fundamental assumption which lay at the core of the U/R concept. Its planners theorized that a redistribution of the power relationship between a school and its community would foster programs at the sites which would be more responsive to the needs of children in that community. Needless to say, a redistribution of power would entail some persons or factions acquiring power and others relinquishing it. Were such transitions made during the programs and, if so, how was this accomplished? How the programs developed (i.e. the process of development itself) was to be examined on the same level of importance as the educational outcomes.

In looking at the scattered placement of the study sites, 3 were in isolated rural areas where low-income children resided just as surely as they did in the other 3 inner-city sites in large metropolitan centers. The selected sites represented a mixture of high and low parity rankings, different ethnicities, a wide expanse of geography, cultural diversity and sundry other

*The U.S. Office of Education extended the funding of the U/R programs for an additional, sixth year.

contrasts.*

Individual interviews were conducted with approximately 10 persons at each site. The overtures made to prospective respondents and explanations of the study were through the courtesy of the local U/R program staff. The role groups included SCC community persons, teachers, SCC chairpersons, team managers, superintendents and a member of the board of education.

Interviews were conducted on-site by 4 investigators with interviews averaging about one hour per respondent. In every instance effort was made to privately interview one person at a time. In those few cases where scheduling would not permit individual interviews, cross-role group interviews were discouraged.

---

*For a description of the high and low parity rankings procedure, see The Urban/Rural Process: Views of the Participants, The Urban/Rural Leadership Training Institute Staff, Report no. 1, p. 6.

HISTORICAL CONTEXT

One of the outstanding events in the recent history of American education occurred outside of the purview but certainly not the interest of its educators. A celebrated milestone was reached almost a quarter of a century ago when the Supreme Court ruled against "separate but equal" public education. That decision, long in coming, held great promise for many, for whom it marked the point of a quantum leap into the educational mainstream.

There were those, of course, who did not so eagerly herald this ruling and all that it would come to mean. Considerable resistance to the new law all too often took the form of interminable chicanery, in attempting to circumvent a decision emanating from the nation's highest court.

Perhaps due to the endless scurrying about and agitation over this, it would be some twelve years later before those aligned on either side of the decision would begin to voice their dissatisfaction with the public schools - however "equal". This time, the problem was not to be placed before the judiciary who had already done their work. It was laid directly at the feet of the educators.

To be sure, the Court's action had set in motion a protracted struggle that, in some form lives today. But whatever the lingering repercussions of the legal decree may have been, the public's quarrel was now with their own particular schools and why they weren't producing. From the mid-sixties and on into the seventies, the schools would find themselves under fire with constant criticism from an increasingly vocal and indignant public.

Faltering student achievement, inadequately and insufficiently experienced teachers, irrelevant curricula, inaccurate textbooks and slanted test instruments merely headed an even lengthier list of citizen allegations. Many of these charges were not without racial or ethnic inuendo and were perceived as part of the aforementioned desegration chicanery.

Enter here again the courts, following an avalanche of studies about learning environments, how children learn and a rash of theories about what was wrong. Suffice it here to say that bussing, forced or by choice and constant redefining of the problem represented short falls in satisfying communities concerns. In the jargon of the day, communities were "up tight" and few of them were reticent about taking the schools to task.

Almost comically, although the seriousness of the times prevented any such perspective, student dress codes and hair length were elevated to places of prominence in the range of educational concerns. Not clearly traceable as either cause or reaction, student disclipline and vandalism were taking their toll in school administrator's headaches and budgets, adding to the antagonisms which were steadily polarizing schools and their communities. And of the two, communities were inclined and perhaps in a better position to take aggressive action in confronting those, thought to be the source of their problems.

In New York City's Ocean Hill-Brownsville school district, violent confrontations raged between parents, teachers, teacher organizations and students. The school system was taken to court in the District of Columbia to break up a track system which for years had stymied the possibilities for student achievement. In Ohio, the city of Columbus, not necessarily in retaliation, closed its schools from Thanksgiving until the New Year for an "extended holiday" because its citizens had rejected additional tax levies.

In these places - in Watts, Chicago and others, disruptions mounted and were themselves, compounding the problems of students which were being protested. Children were not learning and schools were held to be at fault.

During this period, the beleaguered public schools were but a part of the unrest and occasional violence in the country. Currently, a special panel studying declining SAT scores described roughly this same period as being one of "unprecedented turbulence in the affairs of the nation".

The Vietnam war, political assassinations, and racial strife were all contributors to the turbulence in the form of student dissidence in higher education, protest marches and demonstrations and the destructive and frightening riots of 1968.

Much has been written about the inter-relatedness of this vast array of upheavals. And whether or not they were all part of some singular mass motivation, they appeared to have commonalities with the furor in public education. Individuals, neighborhoods, communities, cities and the citizenry in general, were reacting to (among other things) what they saw as the unresponsive rigidity of the old institutions (schools, universities, law enforcement agencies, the lower courts, the government, etc.). Frustration seemingly grew out of the established ways of relating to them, their perceived failure in fulfilling their purposes and the apparent futility of orderly protest and dissent involving them.

It was within this context that parents, community leaders, educationally oriented groups and aspiring politicians raised their voices in demand of "community control" of the schools.

Sad to say, as communities leveled their charges against the schools and rallied for change, school administrations countered with a charge of their own. Presumably out of their resentment over what they viewed as intrusions into their professional domain, administrators and fellow educators were given to hurling back the inflamatory accusation that - communities (perhaps they would want to say "some communities") were not qualified to make educational judgements and decisions.

ABOUT THEM ALL

(some comments)

In the early 1970's while many bureaucracies were willing to be advised by communities, and communities were insistent upon control (especially of schools), the U/R program design proposed a refreshing and, for that era, rather daring compromise. It bargained for an equal partnership between educational consumers (communities) and providers (schools), in making decisions about the U/R program, which would be placed in and impact upon the schools. The clients and professionals would be placed in equal numbers on a governing board (school-community council) which would be funded by the government and delegated authority by the local educational agency (LEA).

Once agreed to by the community and LEA, this pact set up potential collision courses among individuals, realigned political subgroups, and was found suspect by some administrators. But more importantly, it was to spawn a new entity of immense potential in the public school community. As the case studies examine that entity, they seem to suggest that the U/R programs should be viewed not in terms of their necessarily hitting the mark in community involvement (although such a view would be relevant) but perhaps the degree to which they perceived the same target.

SCC STRUCTURES

At each of the sites studied a mere reading of the SCC membership roster where occupations were listed found all to have a numerical balance of school personnel and persons not employed in the site school(s). This later group would be the "community" segment of the council.

Eligibility requirements for membership varied significantly from site to site with each having developed its own, unique criteria.

Many stressed having a child in the U/R school as a requirement. Others felt comfortable with the language of the guidelines where community meant "other than school staff". Some limited the term of membership others did not.

In the case studies and elsewhere, structural parity had been more or less taken for granted. It seemed desirable, easily attainable and what's more, it was part of the mandate. The studies corroborated that yes, it existed, without exception.

And yet - something was implied by the insistence upon "structural parity" on councils. Was that implication one of concern for assuring that councils balance the judgements of professional educators with those of objective others in the community? Or did that insistence argue for the councils to be made up, as suggested by one of the U/R designers, "...of those rendering and those receiving services"?

Although the mutual exclusiveness of these two concepts is problematical, emphasis on one or the other, as an eligibility criterian, would result in quite different kinds of persons becoming SCC community members. The same words were always used in the studies to identify who the respondents were to be. Teachers, school administrators, etc., were to be included and on the other side of the fulcrum, community persons. More than a dozen such persons were interviewed in the studies, on the assumption that their perceptions would be different from those of school personnel and this would provide a well rounded picture of the makeup of the councils.

At one site a community person on the SCC was, as well, a member of the board of education! At another, one SCC community member was a professional social worker and another a professional, clinical practicioner, which occasioned a teacher to comment that, "the community representatives are more middle class than representative of the poor.....".

In looking at four other sites, it was found that numbered among SCC community persons were an elderly pensioner, a farmer, a charwoman, an unemployed, husbandless, mother of three children and others of marginal economic status. At these locales, "community person" more consistently seemed to mean being of the same socio-economic status as the majority of low-income families represented by children in the site school(s). While the lines of demarcation in background of each of these groupings was not absolute, they were striking.

The actual case studies describe these SCC structural differences in some detail. Here, discussion will be limited to only some general observations.

First, the now defeated war on poverty, in attempting to make reference to, without demeaning the poor, disenfranchised population - called them community people or persons. These code words are not without ambiguity in attempting to balance a school-community council's membership. The connotation may vary geographically and across cultures. It may comment on where as well as how one lives. But whatever it implies, it has not uniformly provided a profile of the backgrounds of "community persons" on the six councils studied.

Interestingly, people who served on councils as community members, who were themselves not disenfranchised, could look upon themselves as bona fide community representatives. There was no evidence presented to the contrary. One such person was a member of his chamber of commerce and saw this as a qualification for membership on the council as a "civic leader".

And second, the problem here, of course, is that the inclusion of such persons on SCC's would not seem to alter the traditional and established manner of constituting governance boards and councils in education. On the other hand, as put by one rural respondent, "poor people (in her community) would include everybody not paid by the school system" - thus making all others equally eligible for a community role on the SCC and membership on the board of education.

The perhaps, overly simple distinction made between school staff and community, did not result in discernible socio-economic differences (between school and community) in SCC membership in rural programs in anything resembling the frequency of that occurance in urban programs. If, in fact, the federal intent was to strike a balance between the franchised (school personnel) and the disenfranchised (the poor in the community), the die, as cast, produced governance structures with dissimilar contours.

The franchised-disenfranchised dichotomy certainly appears to be at the core of the federal mandate for structuring of school-community councils. That is, it hardly seems likely that the U/R program designers were advocating balanced community and school membership on the councils merely to satisfy some geometrical need. In the most conservative view, they proposed equal representation out of a sense of fairness to the community and the schools.

Students were not doing well in school and neither the schools nor communities could account for this, short of blaming each other. There might be some wisdom in their joint decision making which may have gone wanting when either made unilateral decisions about the problem.

Or, from another point of view, which goes a bit further, the U/R program designers might have been convinced that a franchised system (including teachers, administrators, board, et al.) may experience difficulty in teaching students from disenfranchised families. After all, it was the children of the poor who, by and large, weren't learning, and whose families were at odds with the system (and probably vice-versa).

Along these lines, the perceptions of the respondents divided the 6 study sites into 2 groups. The sites within each group are more like each other in membership structure, than similar to the other group. For purposes of discussion, one group will be called ALPHA and represents 4 sites. The other will be designated BETA, and will include the other 2 sites.

Basically ALPHA (4 sites) represents sites where the community membership of the SCC appears to have been generally recruited from among persons, alluded to previously, of the same socio-economic status as the majority of low-income families represented by children in the site school(s). BETA (2 sites), on the other hand, looks as if it has, and in fact, is said by its investigator to have, a different "social context" which influenced recruitment.

The ALPHA and BETA distinctions are based on the differences in the community membership of the 6 SCC's in the case studies. The distinctions grew out of a comparison of the backgrounds of the community interviewees and all role group's comments on community membership on SCC's. As shall be seen, this theme is recurrent and significant in understanding the SCC process and Urban-Rural productivity.

SCC PROCESS

> Community involvement: does it mean more involvement by the community in the school, working with the kids? Does it mean more involvement by the community in all policy issues having to do with the school? Does it mean primarily more involvement on fundamental dollar issues?
>
> A TEAM MANAGER

In this phase of the study there were no ambiguous code words nor elusive concepts (such as representational governance). Respondents were simply asked to comment on - whether, during council meetings, community members and teachers took equally active parts in discussions and decision making?

At all sites, there was unanimity in the perceptions of superintendents, team managers and board members, that teachers and community both fully participated and were equally influential members of their councils. One urban superintendent did observe that early on, "teachers usually held the leadership positions, but this eventually changed". He was suggesting here a leveling off of what might be construed as teacher dominance.

Among those closer to the action - actual SCC members - consensus was not so easily reached that mutual give and take was evenly balanced between school and community. In the larger ALPHA group, serious questions were raised by SCC teachers and community members regarding each other's participation and occasionally their own group's behavior.

Teachers and community members both recognized that there was an initial period of discomfort on the part of community persons. These were new and uncharted waters for most of them. Expressing her own feelings (which were supported by many others) a community member summed it up, "community members felt intimidated by professionals". Following this, after members became better acquainted with each other, ALPHA site members' views on their council's interaction splintered in two opposite directions.

At one ALPHA site teachers expressed recurring frustration in that they, "bent over backwards to respect the community's point of view". But, apparently while doing this, other teachers, "grew weary of trying to accommodate the community". Some teachers resented this lack of reciprocity and complained that, "the community didn't put forth as much effort in trying to understand the teachers' point of view".

At the same ALPHA site a teacher's aide, and mother of 5 site school children believed the council process to be "dominated by professionals" and, "one sided". Some community members believed that some of their own number had been "pro-staff and not supportive of the community", as stated by a SCC chairman who was, "from the community". Or, in this same program, a community person felt that others had labeled her as, "co-opted by the school".

The SCC chairperson described all of this as, "a real free-for-all, and no fun", but felt that, "the conflict and antagonism which was brought out into the open was inevitable" and that, "much had been accomplished". Little doubt exists that these meetings were free, open and fully participated in by teachers and community (functional parity).

At the other 3 ALPHA sites, teachers and community members stood firm on their observation that there had been equal, full and easy participation between them. Such statements were not directly challenged nor seldom contradicted by either faction.

These community members admitted to no frustration at council meetings, no hostilities, doubts, intimidation or other negative feelings which were customarily mentioned by all other ALPHA SCC members. Could this possibly be so?

Responding to questions about the quality of community member's participation on her council, one SCC parent lavished praise on the conduct of the meetings and how everyone expressed their views and ideas. Some moments later in the interview, she casually mentioned two significant problems in the school for which she had solutions.

As it turns out, she has never brought them up in a council meeting for several reasons, a few of them being: (from the taped interview)

- "they (SCC) may not go along with it .....I thought maybe it was cuckoo 'cause I thought of it"
- She has already brought one of the ideas up with the team manager - no action taken and not brought up at council
- "I don't know how far I'm allowed to go to bring up anything .....I never tried to bring up anything"

> - "You have to be careful - you can't just come up here (to the school) and take over. It would be different if I was a member of the staff but I'm a mother and I've got to respect the board of education."

This portion of the interview concluded with her correctly pointing out to the interviewer that the council chairperson (a teacher) and the team manager worked for the board of education. (The interviewer interpreted this to mean that, while these two persons were each in a position to act upon her ideas - they represented a kind of danger to her as board employees, if she were to become outspoken about her suggestions.)

One can do no more than wonder about the possible existence, pervasiveness and distribution of this phenomenon throughout ALPHA.

This feeling of vulnerability and lack of assertiveness did not manifest itself in BETA sites. A BETA site investigator, commenting on an SCC community person who is also a member of the local chamber of commerce (noted previously) says, "he views himself and others on the SCC as being civic leaders for whom U/R has provided an additional and potent avenue for expressing views as they pertain most generally to community development .....". Comment has also previously been made about the other SCC community member at this site who is an agency professional.

Another excerpt from the same site's case study may help in further illuminating this aspect of the BETA picture:

> "One becomes aware immediately of the often voiced opinion that the SCC is now and has always been comprised almost entirely of relatively well-to-do, socially influential people. In every case but two, interviewees felt that the SCC had been unable to attract, as members, individuals from the poorest sub-communities."

Although somewhat different in character, without question, there is school-community process or interaction on this council. In comparison to ALPHA councils, however, this SCC appears to have a greater degree of homogeniety amongst its membership. It is this kindredness or affinity which would, at least theoretically, facilitate in-house interaction, that differentiates this site from its ALPHA counterparts.

The more significant interaction apparently is between the SCC and the non-SCC community. This process, as put by its investigator, is a matter of knowing how, "to function outside of the existing (established educational) structure while carefully avoiding placing itself (the SCC) in direct conflict with other (community) agencies and individuals".

This at least is the impression given by the most recently operating regime. It seems that at some point in the past, the interaction and membership of the SCC were quite different, as described by an interesting quote from the case study, "owing to the early involvement of several extremely vocal and contentious community people who utilized the SCC as a platform from which criticisms regarding teachers were forcefully and openly leveled". (It is inferred from this that, perhaps this site began much as an outspoken ALPHA site might have, and somehow transformed itself into a BETA site.)

At the other BETA site, all respondents, including the community representatives are, or have been, either teachers or school administrators in that community. And, as noted earlier, one of the SCC community members is, in addition, a member of the board of education. Here the SCC process, in terms of balanced contribution, would seem to be between the SCC, as an extra-educational body, and the establishment members of its own group. Therefore there are differences of opinion - and they are freely expressed. As was somewhat defensively pointed out by SCC members, "one could not predict the outcome of a decision based solely on the role groups of those supporting it .....". Others characterized the give and take as follows, "at times, the school and project administration prevailed and on other occasions they voted on the losing side". If, as the case study investigator reports, "low income community residents ......have not been highly involved", those remaining to debate the issues are the administration and teachers.

The reader should be cautioned, not to assume any lack of insight on the part of BETA participants regarding their departure from, what here is called, ALPHA. They are fully aware of how ALPHA councils are structured and BETA teachers were candid in stating that, "the community is not very active". And, the community representatives (who are former teachers) acknowledged, "the paucity of community involvement in the school-community process".

BETA councils inducted into their membership, community persons who seemed to have already been in the social mainstream through business, professional and civic pursuits. In addition, as mentioned by one investigator, "nearly all members of the SCC have known each other for years". It is their former identities and relationships as individuals (prior to SCC membership) which forms the commonality between BETA SCC's.

Little mention has been made thus far about the role of team managers (TM) in the SCC process. While they are not members of councils, it should not be inferred that they are excluded from the process.

Ostensibly, the TM was to serve at the behest of the SCC as its executive officer. Organizationally they were paid through the LEA, and if tenured, maintained this status when U/R legislation expired. In those programs with active and interested superintendents (which would include almost all case study sites) TM's were the liaison persons between the LEA and SCC. This latter circumstance would seem to place the TM in a precarious position with regard to loyalty, although no TM expressed this feeling directly. No respondents even questioned this as a potential difficulty with possible exception of the community person previously mentioned, who was wary of stepping out of line with someone who, "worked for the board of education".

Two anecdotes related to an investigator informally may serve to point up the ambiguity of the TMs participation in the SCC process. Put brutally, the problem was one of who's the boss.

At one site, a relatively new TM quite sincerely commented about feeling somewhat remiss in performing on the job by relating to the SCC as an employee. Further stating (ironically) that something must be done to change that back to the way it used to be when the previous TM had behaved in a manner which made it clear that the SCC served at the behest of the TM.

In another instance, an SCC chairperson's travel request to attend an U/R conference (in a distant city) was irreversibly rejected by the TM because the chairperson had on many previous occasions not returned from conferences with reports for the local U/R participants.

In the first anecdote, the problem appears to be simply one of role definition. But if the comments about the previous TM are accurate, the lack of role definition had been not only of considerable duration, but also, seemingly either accepted as uncertain or accepted as something other than one of the TM serving as staff to the SCC.

In the second case, its possible that the TM was merely adhering to that program's policy. Yet, even then it would seem that the travel refusal would be made by the SCC itself, on notification from the TM that there had been a breach in the program's regulations.

These incidents are not cited to point up TM's short-comings, but to illustrate the fact that although they were not eligible voters in the councils, their positions were extremely influential in SCC determinations. It should be noted that the two team managers commented upon are revered by their SCC's, highly respected by their LEA's, and both are from urban, ALPHA, high parity ranked sites.

The development of the 6 school-community governance groups studied occurred at approximately the same times and all were given the same mandate. The 6 programs were spotted throughout a large geographical area, half of them in big cities and the remaining three in rural locales.

A major focus of the case studies was directed towards an understanding of school-community councils as governance entities for the 6 year U/R programs. Investigation was made into both the composition of SCC's and the resultant processes of the councils, with regard to structural and functional parity.

The concepts of structural and functional parity may themselves be discrete formulations, but once applied in programs, not easily isolated and identified due to a powerful third element upon which the two concepts were superimposed.

This third factor was the existing social and/or political circumstances typically prevailing at these two kinds of sites - into which the fundamental U/R mandates were woven. Because of this, in some measure, urbanism and ruralism did account for differences in the developmental process of the programs studied.

There were ways in which U/R programs unfolded in urban areas which looked to be different from the development of rural programs. In large cities, the enthusiasm for participation or just getting in on what was happening, although not productive of large numbers of participants, was a feeling often expressed by urban community persons. The impression is conveyed of school and community people coming together as fundamentally a neighborhood phenomenon.

Superintendents and a board member or two were, at best, occasional high-level visitors to the U/R offices and schools. Conversely, there were those times when the team manager met "downtown" with the city's educational administrators or the board. But generally, SCC meetings and other school-community activities were left to the neighborhood(s) and localized in and around the U/R schools.

At rural sites, perhaps because U/R funds represented a significant supplement to the local school system budget, the fact that their populations were not organized into neighborhoods and the school system's administration included so few people, the urban-rural project seemed to be a more intimate part of the township structure and its community leaders.

These two different types of predispositions to U/R program development show up as determinants of how structural parity was interpreted locally and also aids in the later understanding of the SCC process.

But, urbanism and ruralism do not sufficiently explain the differences in ALPHA and BETA U/R programs (one ALPHA site is rural). In addition, ALPHA and BETA do not conform to the high-low parity rankings mentioned elsewhere. BETA parity rankings are divided, one high, one low. ALPHA rankings are 2 high and 2 low.

In the final analysis, whether or not U/R programs developed into the ALPHA or BETA mold depended upon the access minority and low-income families had into the educational system, (real or perceived) as the programs were initiated. Access here need not necessarily mean nor imply full acceptance as will be shown in the next section (Outcomes).

In the 3 urban, ALPHA sites it was not difficult to identify the minority population and the poor - as distinct from the majority and more affluent. More than 80% of the enrollment of each of the urban site schools was made up of their city's largest minority population, which by a variety of measures was poor. In fact in those urban centers, low-income seems to be used as a synonym for minority.

Even though there is little evidence that these urban systems had sought out the poor of its communities as potential educational partners previously, the incentive of federal funds was able to overcome any earlier inhibitions. By whatever definition the U/R may have had in mind, these were what urban centers construed as "community people". These highly identifiable, low-income minorities who were school specific within the system, became the ALPHA participants at the 3 urban sites.

The 2 BETA sites were both rural and seemed to have wrestled with quite a different problem from their urban counter-parts. These two rural sites, in considering minority and low-income groups' needs, "low-income" was the operative word and was not at all synonymos with minority. The concept of "poor" cut across racial lines instead of serving as a line of demarcation between them. And, minorities represented less than 18% of the BETA sites' school system enrollment. In effect, rural sites scanned their system-wide (2 or 3 schools) enrollment and township population in looking at the prospects for an Urban-Rural program, while urban systems looked at the poor communities within their systems' large city population. The difference in these perspectives would account for minorities being under-represented in the BETA sites.

Finally then, it is the third rural site which resists falling into the "proper" classification - it is neither fish, fowl nor BETA - as are the other rural sites. Its community residents are considered generally to be poor with a minority population of 30% (who are assumed to be at least as poor as the other 70%).

However, the minority population somehow garnered or was granted access into the educational system in the U/R program.* It operated on the previously mentioned township model (township as opposed to the neighborhood school model) where "minority" was not synonymous with low-income. In spite of this, the minority community was sufficiently assertive with the township power structure so as to achieve minority as well as low-income representation in the membership of the school-community council.

---

*The case study suggests that perhaps both garnering and granting were involved in the minority-majority struggles, in its mention of racial tension and the superintendent's remarks, indicative of his enlightened response to that issue.

The case study researchers are far more certain that there is a rural-ALPHA site than they are about why it developed that way. It does have a higher percentage of minority members in its community than the rural BETA sites and an even higher ratio of minorities (50%) in its school enrollment.

The sheer weight of numbers, though perhaps necessary, would seemingly have to be matched by a benevolent and enlightened township establishment, as early first steps in developing a rural-ALPHA, U/R program.

OUTCOMES

The case studies revealed U/R to be fertile ground for the production of processes, understandings, procedures and yet other more tangible creations. People, things, events and environments were affected in a host of ways.

To be sure, there were those who would identify non-productivity as well. In one program which accented bicultural education, a community member commented that, "there was too much emphasis on beads and folklore and not enough on academics...". Or, another community person who in commenting on her SCC stated that, "that element of the program probably had limited success". And still another program where most respondents volunteered that while there had been, "little if any community involvement, it was not felt that there existed much, if any antagonism toward the U/R project in the community" (most likely an unintended pot-shot).

While the generative capacity of the sites was both abundant and varied, virtually every respondent had witnessed and identified a common product of the U/R experience at 4 of the 6 study sites. This outcome was usually mentioned spontaneously and was described as permanent and as having more value than any other U/R feature.

It was stated in a community whose school enrollment was 500 just as emphatically as it was in an enormous urban center where 100,000 students attend school. But however, it was specifically applicable to the U/R site school(s).

This phenomenon was described variously as, a more wholesome and open atmosphere, improved climate and attitudes, the development of, "respect for each other among students and teachers", "high degree of morale and commitment", and significantly, respect between teachers. When asked for an example of this latter circumstance, a black teacher related the following anecdote:

> "There was a time when - if another teacher called on the phone and asked to borrow a book from you - you would ask first if she were black or white. During Urban/Rural - you wouldn't think of doing that."

Numbered among the more subtle intangibles was the role of SCC's in providing support to superintendents and others. Superintendents did not overtly label the SCC's role in this way but rather, described SCC's in supportive terms, such as one who said that during a period of racial tension the SCC provided, "the vehicle that allowed them (his administration) to cope". Going further, he said about the SCC, "it certainly is a structure that makes more sense than a host of advisory committees dealing with various title acts and special projects that had preceeded it".

His like number in another community saw the SCC as the optimum avenue for interaction between school administration and the community (in his case this meant hundreds of thousands). He therefore stated his interest in having, "an SCC at each (several hundred) school". This happened to coincide with a state mandate that all school boards must have a parents advisory board.

Some board members shared the superintendents' views, but for slightly different reasons. SCC's provided a microcosmic community which was available, interested and forthright in, "telling it like it is". One board member regretted, "not having had the foresight to ask for a seat on the SCC". Another recognized that the central school, "staff may cut, or want to cut, the budget for groups like the SCC's", but that SCC's are his best source of advanced information about, "the mood and interests" of the community. It's up to him then (and other board of education members) to "intercede in budget determinations between the community and central office staff".

The list of intangibles far exceeds those mentioned above, but for present purposes - it can be seen that they are pervasive and extend beyond teachers, students and administrators. It may be worth noting that, "intangible productivity" was mentioned only by ALPHA respondents.

Turning to substantive and visible outcomes, they were not only numerous but surprisingly innovative. A good bit of the surprise was due to the uncluttered simplicity of many of the ideas - coupled with their effectiveness.

All of the sites, not surprisingly, were able to do more in inservice teacher education than would have been expected without U/R. After all, that basically was the name of the game.

But it was called other names as well. When advanced degrees and increases in numbers of certifications began to abound, community persons took note, one of them experiencing this as, "a sore point, especially in a small town that is severely economically disadvantaged". (This was interpreted to mean that the respondent was concerned that federal funds would be used to eventually help the children of the poor only by first benefiting the not-so-poor teachers.)

Other detractors suspected, "that motivation was directly connected to stipends". When asked why teachers participated in U/R training programs, one teacher responded frankly that, "the price was right".

These and many other debatables surfaced during the studies, many of which were probably predictable. Few innovations were cited in the acquisition of credentials or in the content of the courses which led to credentialing.

It was the new-found educational delivery mechanisms, the creation of unique solutions to old nagging problems, the discovery of ways to link schools and communities and perhaps the rediscovery of the "Hawthorne Effect" which spawned or were themselves the innovations.

In their early years, the study sites usually developed programs along one, and not more than three dimensions. The breadth of programming included teacher, community and occasionally SCC training. The sites that began as (and some fundamentally remained as), basically one dimentional programs, concentrated, not inappropriately, upon teacher training. An investigator at a rural site, in its sixth and final U/R year, reported that, "although respondents emphasized the recently developed community education programs, there was a universal and strongly stated conviction that the basic intent of U/R has been teacher education....".

Another investigator writing about an urban program says, "initially, there seemed to be a fairly equal distribution of training programs between teachers and community persons. A variety of workshops were conducted for each group". At a third site, in discussing early U/R development, the team manager commented that initially, the site began with teacher, community and U/R staff training.

Some sites followed a fairly traditional route which limited training, as did a rural site where they, "concentrated on upgrading the qualifications of teachers through advanced degree programs....". Others, over time, expanded their perspectives so that by the third year of the program, training, at the most recently mentioned urban site, for example, included:

1. Training of the SCC
2. Inservice training of the school development team (SDT)
3. Inservice training of faculty in 4 site schools
4. Training of community people to become school outreach workers

5. Training of parents and other community members as tutors *

Training, once programs solved some of their start-up problems, began to make twists and turns to accomodate site-specific and individual needs. A rural program made available, "the opportunity for teachers to submit (to the) SCC mini-proposals funded up to $300". It is not difficult to imagine the stimulation to teachers and their effectiveness with students where teaching and learning opportunities are tailor made. In this same program, a need was recognized for, "the establishment ....of new information and educational resource linkages between school, other institutions and agencies and the community". Their solutions to this problem, "were apparently successful", according to a researcher.

But, perhaps more important, it was this new order of things, the U/R program and its own SCC, that made it possible to take a fresh look at what was needed - as well as bringing about change. At another site, rural isolation itself was taken on as an educational problem. With the nearest university more than ninety miles away, a resident professors project was successfully developed and placed on site for a period of over two years. The reader would probably concur with the investigator's comment that, "on the national scene, instances of this type are extremely rare".

In only two documented instances, among the studied sites, was it recognized that in addition to the need U/R programs had to pass on information to the community, the reverse could represent an even greater need. That is, school improvement, community involvement, setting priorities and all, would most effectively take place where the SCC could maximize its communications from, as well as to the community.

Possibly due to the sheer numbers of people and schools involved,

*From a 1973, LTI Site Visit Report

and in support of representatives, an urban program never-the-less made provision for multiplying the signals they would receive from the community. And, conceptually, this was recognized, prior to original U/R funding.

In the initial planning of this program, each of several schools was to have its own SCC. These school-specific SCC's would elect members to represent each school SCC on a joint council. This structure served a number of purposes, and among them was increasing by many-fold, the numbers of community persons who could serve as conduits for school-community and community-school communications.

In addition, efforts to open up community-school communications are revealed by one of this site's 1972 program objectives:

> Community Information Conferences: This aspect was designed to provide neighborhood based training to enable residents to be exposed to the program and to encourage them to relate to the council by feeding information and ideas to assist council members.*

To get their U/R program started initially, another site set up meetings called "community group sessions" (CGS) out of which grew the SCC and other U/R related organizations. The CGS continues, is attended by teachers, and the U/R staff serves as its advisors and resource persons. One of the many functions served by the CGS is that of providing a network for feeding information in both directions between the community, site schools and U/R program.

The setting up of networks of communication to and from U/R programs and their communities occurred at two urban sites but this model clearly has sufficient merit to be considered for other applications.

In reviewing the actual case study narratives, the reader will encounter further elaboration of the U/R programs' productivity.

*U/R 1972 Refunding Proposal

Selected here for comment were merely some of the U/R outcomes which seemed to represent traceable differences in the developmental history of the 6 study site programs.

ALPHA 1
U/R SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM
(A CASE STUDY)

1.0 THE SITE (CITY AND U/R SCHOOLS)

This city ranks as medium size within this industrialized/agrarian state and, is itself, highly industrialized. It is situated such that air travel must be combined with considerable ground transportation for access; its access highways are superb.

The downtown business and commercial area does not appear to be given to the massive neglect and decay so typical of the moderately large cities of this region. Moreover, there is considerable new construction and many buildings present freshly renovated exteriors and well landscaped grounds.

Beyond this, glaring inconsistencies begin to emerge. By cab, from downtown to the U/R administrative offices, after passing modern condominiums with large grassy areas, one stretch is along an unpaved street dotted with extremely deteriorated housing, some of it abandoned.

The U/R schools, built at the turn of the century, serve a predominately black, welfare supported population. The schools are situated in areas whose descriptions have, through constant usage, become stereotyped. Case study respondents described - transient families, displacement by urban renewal, ethnic migration, flights to the suburbs by the affluent and the possibility of one of the unsightly U/R schools closing, presumably because it is an embarrassment to the educational establishment.

2.0 THE PEOPLE (INTERVIEW RESPONDENTS)

2.1 SCC Chairperson -

is a young, white, energetic teacher and an original council member. The chairperson is well respected by all respondents who made comment and is popular among parents, students and fellow teachers.

2.2 Superintendent -

is white, from the south, insightful and has held this position for more than a decade. He has the reputation among blacks of being a liberal in his hiring and promotional practices to a far greater extent than his northern born and educated predecessor. He is a polished and articulate professional whose preeminence as an educator may have been over shadowed by his lack of confidence in the community.

2.3 Board of Education Member -

is a white, affluent, well educated, "professional volunteer" who speaks with not inconsiderable candor and accuracy about the dilemmas with which the board is faced. This quite personable board member is surprisingly knowledgable about the U/R project, the population served by it and the dynamics of poverty and their effects upon public education.

2.4 Team Manager (Project Director)-

is a black, enigmatic, ex-school teacher with enough years in service to retire, yet lacking the desire to do so. He has an intense civic pride; and as a native of the city is rather facile in working within the white bureaucratic educational structure, which includes a proper display of deference to the superintendent.

2.5 First Community Person (one of two interviewed)-

is a pleasant, obese, black mother and only parent of seven, who scrubs floors at night in office buildings and whose vitality probably belies her age and most certainly her burdens. She has been a SCC member since October '76, gains much satisfaction from her involvement, is posessed of good ideas which she can convincingly articulate, and whose insight into functional parity on the council is practically non- existent.

2.6 Second Community Person -

is a black mother of four who was a member of the SCC from the beginning, a past president of the PTA, was the Model Cities representative to the SCC, has a husband who is Assist. Deputy Dir. of Model Cities, and apparently as a consequence of her long experience with the system, is rather overbearing in her manner. She is now otherwise employed and not very active in school matters.

2.7 First Teacher (one of four interviewed) -
is a white, unmarried, thoughtful teacher who prefers the center city teaching environment to other possibilities. While a teacher of at least 6 to 8 years experience, her style is much like Poitier's as a rookie teacher in To Sir With Love. As she sees her students, an understanding of pimping and prostution may have to preempt other teaching considerations because (a) time is growing short (Junior Hi) and (b) that's what the kids want to know about the most and understand the least.

Her contact with U/R has mostly been as a regular and enthusiastic workshop participant and she has had only peripheral contact with the SCC.

2.8 Teacher Number Two -
is white, well liked by his peers, trusted by the students, was involved in original U/R planning, has worked in both U/R schools and was a Junior High student of the team manager. In point of fact, he is not teaching but is now an assistant principal. He has been a representative to the SCC from each of the U/R schools and recently stepped down from the council when the building principal was elected, so that "administration wouldn't be over represented".

2.9 Teacher Number Three -
is a young, white, outspoken member of the SCC (for the past 4 years). She is committed to U/R, as indicated by her long standing participation and active involvement, but she has not been sensitive to the passive and acquiescent role (albeit self imposed) played by the community members on the SCC.*

---

* This lack of insight was prevalent among all professionals interviewed with the possible exception of teacher number four.

2.10 Teacher Number Four -

is young, white, and has a good grasp of how the community surrounding his school operates and takes more than a required interest in his students. He's taught for more than 7 years, and through his participation over the last 2 years on the council, understands the programatic function of the SCC as it relates to teachers. Acknowledging that parents on the SCC do not speak up and take an active part, he, in part agrees with this posture in that at this time, "most of the council's work is already done". In addition, and I would presume he'd include himself again, there is "lack of knowledge about what they're (parents) supposed to do.

3.0 NATURE OF COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT (perceptions by role groups)

It appears that those persons in the program at or near the top of the educational hierarchy are far more likely to assume the community to be involved than those near the bottom. The superintendent, deputy superintendent, and team manager report a far greater degree of community involvement than do others.*

Put bluntly, most of the teachers and one parent do not see this community as being involved. In their view, an extremely large and preoccupied community has produced a few parents who have become involved in their school's activities, no more-no less. Generally the uninvolved parents are not scorned for their passive behavior, rather, the respondents defend them. Looking at the varying perceptions of the community by role groups, it seems clear that each group is working from a different information base.

3.1 The superintendent is not a member of the SCC and has never attended a council meeting. As the program began, the council and superintendent were wary of each other and the teachers on the council were opposed to the superintendent's attending SCC meetings. Eventually they softened, but by this time the superintendent, recognizing the possibility of being coopted or worse, out voted, chose to use the

* Unknown to the interviewer, the superintendent had directed his deputy and the team manager to be present during this interview.

site school's principals as SCC "monitors". This action may have been taken on the basis of the presumption that the council did have potential power.

In essence then, mechanisms were established by which the community could communicate with the authorities and this was (and is) roughly equated with, or even construed to be involvement.

3.2 The team manager, much like the superintendent, takes a fairly traditional, middle class view of community involvement. He sees the press as a good form of communication with the community, thinks it a good idea to get press coverage of positive human interest stories in the school and is pleased with structural parity on the council as an index of community involvement. (He expressed disappointment in the SCC structure however, in that business was not represented on the council to fully round it out.)

There is little doubt that the T.M. acts in any but the most professional manner as regards the SCC. He sees himself as a staff to the council, behaves accordingly and is well liked and respected by the membership. Yet, he is never-the-less seen as "part of the BOE" by the SCC. The result is that suggestions, proposals and plans go up (to the superintendent, as filtered through the T.M.) and concurrances or vetos come down (to the SCC as filtered through the T.M.)

As far as could be ascertained, few, if any effective attempts have been made to communicate with the silent majority of U/R community members and parents regarding their thoughts or needs. In another area of potential school-community interaction, conflicts which may occur between community and school are handled in one of three ways:

- individual complaints from the community are handled on an individual basis by the school administration, or
- the issue above might be escalated to the superintendent's office and handled on an individual basis there, and
- school-community conflicts arising in the SCC (which seems quite remote) would be resolved in the council without any overture to the superintendent.

3.3 The board member, perhaps because of her role as an elected official, looks at community involvement as critical (theoretically). The community must be involved, the board exists to serve the community, it is good, if not imparative, to have the community represented on the SCC, etc. On the other hand, because of her experience and training, she is not totally unaware of the difficulties in school-community communications. "Physical and biological needs necessarily lower the priority of education in very poor communities" (which deftly and perhaps not consciously, places the onus on neither community nor school).

The board, according to this respondent, yawns during U/R "show and tell" presentations to them. These are reviews which take place after programs have been implemented. But, she expresses belief and trust in the SCC as a vehicle for community involvement and regrets that she or another board member did not have the forsight to ask for a seat on the SCC.

3.4 The teachers seem to be the most frustrated by the limited community involvement and the total inaccessability of most parents. It may be worth mentioning again that most of the teachers and community person number one do not believe the community is involved. And, incidently, community person number two did not contradict number one above but described a greater degree of participation when the U/R program was initiated.

Teachers are quite well aware that their students are from families of five to seven children, more often than not in homes without fathers. They therefore aren't resentful about the lack of participation; they merely voice their grave concern for the need.

3.5 The parents interviewed have related to the U/R program at different stages in the program's development. Parent number two was secretary of the U/R Rural Planning Group during the summer of '71. She describes that period as one of bustling activity, parents and community people being worked with as a group (LTI's Badgett), and with considerable responsiveness and enthusiasm from the community. Having been active in the PTA and with 4 children destined for one of the U/R target schools, it is not difficult to imagine her optimism and willing participation. This was apparently a pervasive attitude among her peers and the educational community working with the OE and the LTI.

No direct expression of the SCC's power potential were elicited in this interview, but the enthusiasm with which the community received the program seems to indicate their high expectations. As the program began its implementation phase, community persons were, perhaps for the first time, used in instructional support roles. Now "on the inside" and part of an important venture, this parent certainly had the feeling of being in on the action which she believed to be power.

Parent number one joined the SCC when school started in the fall of 1976, and describes the parents as being troubled financially, harried by the demands made upon them by their large numbers of fatherless children, and as having little time and even less energy to take part in school activities. She seemed more stimulated and elated by her own involvement than surprised by the limited participation of others. As she stated, "I'm no Bionic woman but" it's very hard to take part.....

According to this parent, the PTA is now defunct and prior to its demise only about 7 parents attended. She has empathy for other parents, gleaned from direct experience, much as the board member did through reading and intellectual analysis.

4.0 THE SCC PROCESS

The council, with it's chairperson usually a teacher, was left to its own devices in the formative years, with the superintendent, as he put it "in absentia". Early in its history, the group (and especially the teachers) pragmatically examined what they believed to be major deterents to learning and determined them to be:

- reading inadequacies
- discipline
- lack of communications between parents and teachers
- inability of students and teachers to relate to each other

From this group, reading was chosen, as it was seen to be the most basic "tool of the trade" (educational). Reading programs were to be mounted involving students, teachers and parents.

As this sequence of events was related by the superintendent, the inference is made that this met with his approval.

Over the years, reading became the fundamental area for training activities with some of the programs granting degree credit through a local university. Some workshops made slots unfilled by teachers available to community people with both groups receiving stipends. Over time, many additional projects were mounted to address other needs.

By most counts, the step from needs assessment (by whatever means) to program implementation was a matter of reaching consensus on the council, and to some degree determining objectives. The staff (T.M.) was then responsible for refining objectives and securing resources and implementers.

Even before the inclusion of community persons in the teacher education programs, considerable effort went into having them assess their own educational needs. They were involved in listing all of their needs, teacher deficiencies, setting priorities, deciding upon modes of instruction, etc. Later, as they moved toward instructional roles, pre and post test instruments were utilized to determine their needs and at what point they could effectively help classroom students.

Trying to trace the decision making patterns for these activities led to only vague recollections of who was involved rather than the origin of ideas. Currently the picture of decision making is unfettered by memory lapses.

A SCC parent (community person number one) responding to questions about the quality of community members' participation on the council lavished praise on the conduct of the meetings and how everyone expressed their views and ideas.

Some moments later in the interview, she casually mentioned 2 significant problems in the school for which she has solutions. As it turns out, she has never brought them up in a council meeting for several reasons, a few of them being:

- "they (SCC) may not go along with it.....I thought maybe it was cuckoo 'cause I thought of it"
- She has already brought one of the ideas up with the team manager - (no action taken and he's not brought it up at council)
- "I don't know how far I'm allowed to go to bring up anything.....I never tried to bring up anything"
- "You have to be careful - you can't just come up here (to the school) and take over. It would be different if I was a member of the staff but I'm a mother and I've got to respect the Board of Education."

This portion of the interview concluded with her correctly pointing out to the interviewer that the council chairperson (a teacher) and the team manager worked for the Board of Education.

The three council member teachers all responded in the affirmative and at length to the question of whether or not the community SCC members felt comfortable, raised questions, expressed their views and took full part in council meetings. (The responses of community person number one flatly contradicted this.)

On balance then, the teachers (and the T.M.) certainly do not in anyway convey the impression of having impeded the full and open participation of the SCC community members. Instead it appears that they have not recognized a distinction between the quality of their participation and that of others —— or, if they have, they've not been able or seen fit to alter the community's involvement in the direction of functional parity. Structural parity is thus rendered dysfunctional and masquerades as school-community collaboration, seemingly without malice of forethought.

5.0 TEACHER TRAINING PROGRAMS

5.1 Initally, there seemed to be a fairly equal distribution of training programs between teachers and community persons. A variety of workshops were conducted for each group. In addition, teachers were able to enroll in college courses, and where slots were available, community people took these courses also. High School Graduation or completion of the GED being a requirement, community people were also supported in this endeavor by the U/R program.

Recently the teachers have been more involved in training than community persons. This is accounted for, in part, due to the teachers being more constant in the program than the community members.

5.2 Workshops with stipends and courses at the local college were the most often mentioned modes of training delivery by all role groups. It seems that the term "workshop" has become generic in describing almost any form of training.

Uniformly, there was far more importance ascribed to the selection of instructors and the indivdual's effectiveness than on the mode of delivery of instruction. The notable exception to this being conference workshops off site which were by far the most satisfying for community persons.

The well attended summer program for degree credit seemed to indicate teacher preference for them.

With several exceptions, which will be noted later, satisfaction was expressed by all role groups regarding "workshops".

All teachers and community people expressed the belief that U/R has made a significant difference - somewhat independent of the quantity, quality and subject matter of the workshops. This difference uniformly (and quite believably) was described as positive changes in attitudes on the part of those touched by the program. These attitudinal alterations included: racial and ethnic sensitivities, respect between students, teachers and parents, pride in the site schools, encouragement on the part of teachers that progress was being made in student teacher relations, and that effective ideas had been generated and implemented to help, here-to-fore, unreachable students.

5.3 U/R resources have been put to use in the site schools in at least two seemingly effective and attractive (to all role groups) non-teacher training activities.

5.3.1 An in-school suspension (ISSP) program was developed which enabled the U/R schools to set up special classes for retaining students for up to 10 days who ordinarily would be suspended or expelled. U/R conceptualized the program and provided for substitute teachers while the regular teachers took turns at holding forth in the ISSP classroom. Referrals can only be made to the ISSP classroom by teachers who agree to conduct the ISSP classroom on a rotating basis.

5.3.2 An extended school day program was developed by U/R which offers students opportunities to interact with their teachers in mutually agreed upon non-academic activities. Students and teachers appear to enjoy and find meaning in relating to each other in these informal and less structured activities.

These two programs certainly do not exhaust the uses made of U/R resources for non-teaching activities, but are those most often described by respondents.

5.4 Problems in Training Activities

Three specific problems have been singled out for this study on the basis of frequency of their being reported and the strong possibility that these are problems which are more pervasive than others in the program.

5.4.1 Attractive workshop titles often do not correspond in substance to the needs of teachers, e.g. "Issues in Black Culture" might take white teachers on a tour of their students' African heritage but does not bring them to a better understanding of the black youngster's current thinking and feeling in any kind of practical way. Or, seminars set up to discuss teenagers' legal rights conducted by local legal authorities do not place the attending students in a position which they trust sufficiently to present their concerns with candor.

5.4.2 Parents involved in training to become instructional aides are involved in programs to improve their skills in helping students, find that at programs end, their newly aquired skills fall short of those already aquired by the students.

5.4.3 On balance, there seems to be a discrepancy between the resources expended for teacher training and the teachers' gnawing and intangible feeling that if these resources could be used to attract large scale parental participation, much more would be accomplished.

6.0 OBSERVATIONS

The influx of new federal monies into this public school system was, as might be expected, welcomed, and occasioned at least three divergent viewpoints. The selected school faculties looked upon these new-found funds as holding the possibility of breaking the lockstep of cultural differences and community separation from schools, which over time, had choked off their effectiveness as teachers.

The site communities looked forward to justifiable increases in allocations to their schools and perhaps equally exhilerating, acceptance into the system, as bonefide participants, in a variety of capacities.

The City's educational administration perceived the additional income as a two edged sword which could improve its ISTE without cutting into its budget, but also as developing an entity which could slice into its control of school matters. The administration's acceptance of the supplemental resources brought with it the need for containment and contain they did.

Perhaps it would be useful to bear in mind that these viewpoints were being formulated in the summer of 1971. Demands by minorities often resulted in heated and sometimes violent confrontations. Community control was perhaps the most ubiquitous catch phrase of the day and quite certainly a most threatening concept to school administrators.

There was yet another force at work which cannot be laid at the feet of the school administration. The U/R program design placed the local program's funds in the public school budget and the superintendent had to approve the appointment of the project director (team manager).

Here then were the instruments of management and control which have served throughout the program's existence. The teachers on the council and the team manager operated within this context as BOE employees in trusty positions. This would, of course, also be true of community persons trained as instructional aides and depending upon their perception, all community persons receiving stipends.

It is in this potentially restrictive framework that we look, perhaps in vain, for structural and functional parity between the school and community for governance of the program.

7.0 SUMMARY INTERPRETATIONS

The attempt to do a longitudinal study of this program during its final year places it at a severe disadvantage. There is reason to believe that the phenomenon of involvement of the community reached its zenith in this project long before the study.

The conducting of training activities is much less given to the uncertain fluctuations of social attitudes and conditions. Consequently it appears as if many teacher and community training programs were mounted throughout the life of the program, but the manner in which they came into being varied markedly over time.

Initally, many levels of school-community needs were identified by the persons with those needs and, molded into appropriate training programs. This was accomplished through a reasonably structured governing council. Much of this took place in an atmosphere of hope, enthusiasm and high expectations on the part of the community people and classroom teachers. They were to be the governing body and creators of ideas for improving themselves and the quality of education in their schools. The federal government had granted them funds for this explicit purpose.

The context in which this was to occur was perhaps misunderstood. The LEA which is traditionally and officially charged with these same responsibilities, quite naturally viewed all of this with considerable suspicion. There is every indication however that each of these factions could, indeed did, agree on needs and objectives.

As the community members and teachers moved ahead with their tasks of developing a governance structure and training programs for themselves, their planning, policies and attitudes were carefully watched by the administration. This was facilitated by having a common liaison person for both groups as spokesman to each group - the team manager. The SCC appears to have initially been oblivious to the shortcomings of this arrangement while the administration most likely entered into it with premeditation.

During the program's developmental period, the council watched (seemingly with sightless eyes) as their potential for parity gradually slipped away. This erosion was further exacerbated by the lethargy which somehow infected the community's vigorous participation.

In spite of all of this, there is convincing evidence that this program did achieve more than would have been accomplished without it. And this is not simply a case of more (community and teacher training) being better than less.

Teachers and community members did improve their skills, and new techniques and information were acquired by more persons than would otherwise have been possible.

All respondents acknowledged that the U/R program had impact and each was able to state specific areas in which it made a difference along their perceptual lines. A difference that practically all respondents perceived was their belief that their attitude towards themselves (in their educational capacities) and each other changed for the better.

In response to questions regarding retaining whatever U/R brought to the site, it was this latter "side effect" which was cited most frequently and with considerable emotion and conviction. In one school, the faculty reported that it (U/R) changed them from a "subject oriented school (which traditionally secondary schools are) to a child centered secondary school".

In varying degrees, for different reasons and along a variety of programatic lines, the superintendent, board member and community participants were relevent participants in (1) providing teachers with more responsive students, (2) providing teachers with more well honed tools with which to impart education (teacher skills) and (3) engendering a greater respect among teachers involved for their own professional skills. Stated or unstated, the techniques for achieving these outcomes will doubtlessly remain after the program's termination.

In view of all of this, there is the sobering fact that the community's participation fell far short of what should have been its planners' expectations. Considering that the student population at this site is greater than 2,000, the ultimate victims of the program are the devastating majority of students whose families did not participate.

Programatically there is overwhelming evidence that this program was of immense value to its recipients and participants. The conduct of the program however, raises the question of whether or not the concept of parity was actually tested and would it have made a difference.

ALPHA 2

U/R SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM
(a case study)

1.0 THE SITE

is a sprawling metropolis, almost 250 years old which shows its age in both charm and decay. Much like other early established urban centers, it has only recently begun taking steps to ameleoriate its deterioration.

Entering the city by ground transportation from almost any direction is an unimpressive experience. During daylight hours, traveling along the clogged arteries leading into the city, the visitor is presented a mediocre skyline, dulled even more by everpresent smog.

Given the opportunity for a closer view, the city is found to be laced with beautiful as well as quaint architecture and meaningful historical settings. However, the principal design for dwellings in the center city is extremely narrow and often garrishly clad tract houses, without benefit of trees or grass.

The U/R program is housed in a compact brick building owned by the BOE, some 15 minutes from downtown. The surrounding neighborhood is predominately black, with modest row housing that, though old, shows some signs of care by their tenants or owners and where there is some meager greenery.

The U/R building shares a large plot (a square block) with one of its affiliated schools and is utilized exclusively for U/R or U/R sanctioned purposes. The facility's interior is bright and imaginatively furnished and decorated. It is within walking distance of the 4 U/R schools and is looked upon with a feeling of accomplishment and pride by the staff who work there and the local participating community.

2.0 THE RESPONDENTS

(4 teachers, 2 community members, school superintendent, SCC chairperson, team manager and member of the BOE)

2.1 THE TEAM MANAGER

(for the past 2 years) is a striking, tall black ex-school teacher from one of the U/P schools. She's been a member of the SDLT from the beginning of the program and is insightful ablut the impact of politics on public education and particularly as such forces affect the U/R school district.

She is an earnest professional, with class and style which are admired by most.

2.2 THE SUPERINTENDENT (DEPUTY)

is white, energetic, charming and who quite possibly had no understanding of U/P until the U/R Airlie conference in December, 1976, having been appointed to his post 3 months prior.

He is in his mid-forties and has had considerable teaching and administrative experience elsewhere in this city's system and has now become a rabid believer in U/R. He states that he would like to replicate the U/R concept throughout the system's schools.

2.3 COMMUNITY PERSON NUMBER 1

is a black, middle aged, undereducated, smart, no-nonsense kind of person. She has children in the U/R schools and has been involved in the program since its inception. The program's appeal for this mother is its making available useful information to community people and the fostering of acceptable roles and role models for kids.

2.4 COMMUNITY PERSON NUMBER 2

is black, in her mid-fifties and a former first grade teacher in one of the U/R schools, now retired and a member and secretary of the SCC. She has been a member of the SDLT and has a good understanding of the U/R programmatic goals.

2.5 TEACHER NUMBER 1

is a young, bright, black professional with 8 years teaching experience and an original member of a SDLT. She has been a member of the SCC for 3 years. She has some doubts about the performance of the SCC but is very satisfied with the operation of the U/R program.

2.6 TEACHER NUMBER 2

is a black, rather quiet, yet alert, original and current member of the SDLT. She has 23 years teaching experience, was a SCC member in its first 3 years.

2.7 TEACHER NUMBER 3

is a chubby, white, affable member of the U/R staff. Prior to this, he taught in one of the U/R schools for 10 years and was an original member of the SDLT. He is perceptive, articulate and quite comfortable as the only white on this comparatively large (nine persons) staff.

2.8 TEACHER NUMBER 4

is an agressive teacher of 6 years experience. She understands her students and the circumstances of poverty from which they come. She has been a member of the SDLT since the beginning, and has respect for the SCC as the policy makers for the SDLT.

2.9 SCHOOL BOARD MEMBER

is a dapper, urbane and thoughtful black, who describes himself as having come "to the board two years ago from the community". He is politically sophisticated, a champion of U/R on the school board and very knowledgeable about the U/R program and its community. His interest in U/R seems to be at once politically motivated and genuine.

2.10 SCC CHAIRMAN

is a retired, over 60, black male who presents a grandfatherly appearance, has a warm manner and is respected by the community. He's been with the

SCC since its inception as either vice-chairman or chairman and is provided an office in the U/R building.

He is quietly glib and titularly head of U/R but displays no leadership in SCC meetings and seemingly has relinquished this function to the team manager and U/R staff.

3.0 COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

This section of the city has evolved as the catchment area for large, poor, black matriarchal families. Two elementary, one junior high and one senior high school are the U/P affiliates for serving their educational needs.

The commercial strips, which form grids in which the residences are checkered, are dilapidated and depressing to view. Spotted among these poor homes and businesses, there are middleclass black families and commercial enterprizes. There are restaurants and a major shopping center frequented by the community's poor and middleclass.

Given all this, no respondent could identify even one leadership figure nor one educational, civic or social organization at the time the U/R program was introduced, other than some semblance of a PTA. As put by one of the teachers, to his dismay, "in this community of the city especially, where needs are greater, you would expect to have found the degree of organization to be greater". This turned out not to be the case. The only meaning which might be contained in this assumption is that the exact opposite was reality.

Teachers described this community as being the least organized area of the city and stated that even at the present time, no recognized leadership has emerged. With the advent of U/R, two activities were proposed, through which the community began to participate. U/R offered some promise of improving the education of this community's youngsters through teacher training and training opportunities were suggested specifically for the yet committed community persons - who didn't necessarily have children in the schools. This latter aspect of training does not appear to have been introduced merely as a ploy to stimulate participation, but as a part of what the U/R planners saw as their legitimate mandate. These two training activities became the rallying points around which involvement was to occur.

The community training function, which returns as a recurring theme in the study, should not be underestimated, as it later will be seen as the continuing basic structure for supporting community involvement. Another support for involvement was the fact that the original U/R teachers (and some principals) were simultaneously residents of the community, faculty in the schools and occasionally parents. The groundswell of community interest then sprang from a complex set of interacting needs in a close knit fabric of teachers, parents and insightful community members.

The U/R staff, and especially their "scouts" (school outreach workers) were able to assemble a group of hundreds for an orientation to the program. Much like a collapsing telescope on being opened, this large group produced an ad hoc committee which developed "community group sessions" out of which came the school-community council.

The latter two groups becomming extant, with each group engaging itself in three common kinds of activities on a shared decision making basis, they worked at (1) proliferating community and teacher involvement (the SDLT structure was formulated by the SCC), (2) developing training programs for teachers and community, and (3) determining what directions the next refunding proposal should take.

According to community persons and teachers, clearly the concept of power was prevelant as they went about these tasks, yet in the telling of it, it was not raw, unbridled and jealously guarded power. It was more a sense that teachers and community persons had that, at long last, some degree of self-determination could be realized.

The "community group sessions", (shepherded by the U/R staff) and the SCC, over time, met regularly but independently, with overlap in their memberships. They assessed the needs of (1), the SCC for training as a council (2), the teachers for improving their services and (3), community persons along a wider spectrum of training possibilities.

The respondent board member's perception is that all of these plans and actions began, and continued to take place, in the context of other events and BOE decisions which were to affect the course U/R had set for itself. Model Cities (which became the Urban Service Program) began to refer community people to U/R training programs. Following a long period of community agitation and upheaval, the state mandated that all boards of education were to have parent advisory boards. These events served notice to U/R that they were current with developing educational policy, or perhaps, on the cutting edge of it. (The deputy superintendent believes U/R to be a program which grew out of community dissent.)

On the minus side, desegration became the order of the day about midway through the life of the U/R program. This brought with it at least two devestating outcomes. First, U/R teachers began to be transferred to schools outside of the community. This was eventually accompanied by teachers establishing residences in other communities. Second, and more inexplicable, family size and fatherless families became even more prevalent. Households with five to ten children with mothers, who according to one teacher, were "home long enough (in the morning) to get the kids ready for school and go on to the second job".

All of these factors brought many peaks and valleys to the quantity of community involvement but did not seem to alter its quality nor the enthusiasms of the involved. Training was to pursue the development of humanistic education for students, community members and teachers.

Over the years the community has been involved in a variety of activities ranging from workshops where the community cast themselves in the role of learner-consumers (understanding life insurance, nutrition and weight control), others where they demonstrated previous training (display of arts and crafts at a regional festival), and still other training in direct support of education in the U/R schools (getting pre-schoolers ready for school, helping children develop positive self images, sex education, etc.).

4.0 SCHOOL-COMMUNITY COUNCIL PROCESS

There seems not to have been a hard line of demarcation between the SCC and "Community Group Sessions" (CGS) with regard to idea development. Some members were common to both groups, although the CGS has never had a fixed membership roster.

CGS is made up primarily of regularly attending community persons but their training and other activities are also engaged in by teachers and community persons who are not regulars. The staff serves the CGS as advisors and resource persons in implementing training projects. Fundamentally, the descriptions of the CGS by community persons and staff indicate it to be the more responsive community constituency of the SCC, the SDLT serving in a similar capacity in the schools. Outreach extends beyond the CGS into the community (especially by the U/R staff "scouts") and into the school through the SDLT. Concerns and ideas are funneled from the community at large and the schools back to the SCC and CGS, purportedly on a rather open basis.

The buck stops at the SCC for decisions on ideas comming from the schools and community, with committee structures set up for handling many of these responsibilities.

Teachers with SCC experience report meetings to be routine, if not outright dull. SDLT teachers and CGS persons not on the council, respect the SCC as the recognized policy making body for the U/R program, although the SCC is commented upon with more reverence by the community people than teachers. It is assumed that the respondents closest to it are implying a greater sense of loyalty to the council's legitimacy on ideological rather than functional grounds. They believe a council does and should exist but they have reservations about its ability.

The U/R staff appears to be the trusted and authoritative strength which nourishes the council, and helps it render well reasoned judgements. As put by a SCC teacher, "staff takes care of the business and moves it on... when SCC meets, they just say okay, go on and do it". Four of them are former teachers in the U/R schools and all are competent in their U/R functions. Three others are community people from the area who have been placed in quite respectable positions in working with that community - a far more powerful constellation than the council itself. Outreach performed by street-smart, grass roots persons with considerable experience as parents - administration, guidance and evaluation executed by well trained, experienced and sophisticated local teachers who have the support of the LEA - makes for a formidable staff.

The council is not obsequious in its dealings with the staff and the latter does not come on as testy or overbearing with the council. Some SCC members seem to be oblivious of the fact that their real source of power benignly resides within the staff. Other, more sensitive members, believe in the necessity of both structures and seem to take a pragmatic view of their combined function.

5.0 TEACHER EDUCATION

There are 4 U/R site schools (2 elementary, 1 junior high and 1 senior high), all located in the same general neighborhood, as is the "Continuing Educational Training (CET) Center", the official designation of the U/R headquarters. These schools represent a kindergarten through twelth grade continuum which is the framework on which the U/R program is built.

According to the team manager (the program's second), two basic elements make up the teacher education program. The first is a School Development Leadership Team (SDLT) in each of the U/R schools, made up of 10 teachers (per team) which is selected by the faculty and administration at each school. This group of 40 teachers and their building principals regularly assess their own training needs, pass this information on to the U/R program staff who then design appropriate training programs utilizing local university faculty and other consultants as instructors.*

Following this training, which is usually provided through workshops at the CET center, the SDLTs are responsible for staff development training of the remaining faculty in their respective school buildings.

The second element of training is that provided through graduate courses for credit at local universities for which the former training described above is sometimes an introduction or follow-up. While all along some teachers who were not on SDLTs were permitted to also take the U/R financed graduate courses, with a change in team managers about half-way through the program, this arrangement was altered so that the non-SDLT teachers became the primary candidates for graduate courses as this provided (1) a wider range of in-service education in the 4 schools and (2) greater incentive for and impact upon non-SDLT teachers.

Emphasis on humanistic education pervades most of the training which has occured in this program, regardless of role group. When asked for a definition of what is meant by the expression, humanistic education, most rerespondents mentioned the attitudes of school related adults and taking into account children's feelings, summed up by the team manager's statement that, "everything that happens in (a) school must be determined by what effect it will have on the student and on his level of academic achievement". Much was apparently done in the areas of student's self concept, interpersonal relationships and human relation etc. both in the U/R workshops and graduate courses at the universities.

Retrospectively appraising the pros and cons of training, respondents found plenty of each. An Urban/Rural program assistant with experience as a teacher in an U/R school, SDLT member and finally an U/R staff member, claimed that teacher training in the program was "fantastic" in that this was where people to people "strategies were learned, tried out later and picked up by others....grad courses were free and often led to professional advancement."

---

*Perhaps it should be pointed out that four of the U/R's 7 staff persons are certified, former teachers. Three of the four (including the team manager) are former SDLT members and the fourth is the U/R program's full-time evaluator.

Training was said to be "vital to being a human being rather than what you thought a teacher should be". It was further said to have halted the trend, following school desegregration, of "white teachers believing themselves always to be right" and "black teachers believing themselves always to be the injured party" in many school problems and conflicts. If the concentration on humanistic education had served a useful purpose when first introduced, desegregation seemed to intensify the need for its continuance, as practically every person interviewed (except community people) tended to describe the most significant value of training in these terms.

On the other side of the ledger, it was not the content of training but other problems which plagued it, tops among them was the belief by teachers that they were super-saturated with training programs. The LEA was aledged, by teachers, to have superimposed many programs upon schools without taking into account their needs or concurrently operating programs. From the U/R staff's point of view, the problems were with this model of training (SDLT) being particularly undermined by school staff transfers (50% during desegregation), apathy of older teachers and a generalized feeling among those not involved in the original planning, that involvement in in-service education implied a weakness in them as teachers, which they resented. As can be seen in the previously mentioned description, the flow of training was from (1) assessment of needs by building principal and SDLT to (2) implementation of training with SDLT as learners, (3) back to the building with SDLT as resource people (instructors) and (4) the previously uninvolved teachers as learners. Although comment was not made to this effect, the opening up of graduate courses to non-SDLT faculty does raise the question of the adequacy of the former arrangement in which their training consisted of distillations of other teacher's training experiences.

6.0 COMMUNITY TRAINING

When asked about the origin and often mentioned high degree of community enthusiasm for training, the U/P staff attributed it to the excitement generated in parents and other community members by their having infiltrated the inner-circle or mainstream of here-to-fore unknown school and community life, sharing other's problems and reaching solutions, and gaining practical skills. In addition, community training was facilitated by placing a person on the U/R staff as a community assistant who worked directly with the community in identifying and securing training resource persons for them. It was the contention of several U/R staff persons that the community was far more amenable to training than were teachers. And, whether they were trained as tutorial or as other school service volunteers, community members were said to "take on and fulfill their volunteer positions as if they were paying jobs".

U/R staff also made the observation that ironically, teachers believe that in-service training will always be available to them through the system someplace (staff believed this to be essentially correct) but community training, which is, according to some staff, "more critical and will die off first" (at the termination of U/R).

7.0 SUMMARY OBSERVATIONS

In 1972, this site initiated its U/R program with a focus on reading, which they had assessed as a fundamental deficiency in their 4 target schools. Apparently this need was recognized as sufficiently generalized in the system's schools that soon a city-wide "Right-To-Read" program was mandated, rendering the smaller U/R reading program redundant. In the wake of this setback and somewhat prophetically, U/R redirected its focus to humanistic education, just prior to the city's desegregation of its schools which would soon amplify the need for such concern.

Little comment was made during the study regarding the program's early history, during the period in which it concentrated on reading. In large measure this was true of many of the activities which took place at this site initially. Considerable turnover among U/R participants accounted for much of this, in that the current team manager, superintendent, and the board member interviewed were not in these positions at that time. It is, of course, also possible that time and the inconclusiveness of those early actions have both contributed to the lesser attention now given them.

Midway through the program a new team manager was appointed and some adjustments made to the U/R staff which, as described by a SCC teacher is, "really on the ball....on top of everything....really organized". The relatively large staff appeared to adequately serve the program needs of the U/R schools and their surrounding community. Four U/R staff persons had formerly been teachers in the system and 3 had been associated with the program prior to their employment as staff.

The SCC reflected structural balance in its make-up and was chaired by a community person who, at the program's beginning, was the vice-chairman. Teachers viewed SCC deliberations as routine and perhaps ponderous, although well meaning and necessary. Teachers' doubts seemed to go beyond the council's style and were related to their perceptions that the council usually followed the staff's lead which, was not described as coercive nor dictitorial.

The superintendent (deputy) and board member both mentioned their appreciation of teacher and community member training but commented more approvingly and in greater detail about the value of the council (or council-like bodies) as a significant organizational (and perhaps political) entity. The former viewing them as useful constituencies and the latter seemingly more interested in them as sounding boards for BOE actions and as spokespersons for the community point of view.

Attendance at a council meeting by the case study investigator, responses by participants, and a review of the amount of community training as against the quantity of teacher training provided no particular insights into the relative balance of influence on the SCC. Neither community members nor school personnel clearly stood out as a dominate faction. Two of the teachers interviewed had similar and not unproductive perspectives on the dynamics of interaction on the council. As they saw it, both SCC sub-groups are passively respectful of each others needs and interests and both are supportive of and overshadowed by a trusted, creative and ambitious U/R staff. Participants were accepting of this shared reliance on their executive officer and staff.

Much of this program's energy has been devoted to community organization, woven around the educational concerns of its schools and residents. That the U/R program established under its own roof (a LEA building) a resource base and source of instructional and problem solving support for teachers, and brought teachers into direct contact with the community's educational consumers both gave U/R credibility and meaning within the ranks of its affected school personnel, and to some degree, its educational officials of higher station.

The community which physically surrounded the U/R building and schools became engaged in the educational process of its young, discovering new interest in its own training and taking a more active part in community life, with the impetus for these activities emanating from the U/R Continuing Education Center. While these factors did not guarantee that a parity relationship would come to exist between schools and community, they did seem to mitigate against them being in conflict or a state of continuing indifference towards each other. U/R, in this instance, appeared to be an answer to a question which neither the schools nor the community had previously been able to formulate.

ALPHA 4
U/R SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM
(A CASE STUDY)

INTRODUCTION

Townville is a small rural community in the north central section of the United States. There are about fifteen hundred residents in the area, 500 of whom attend the Townville Community School. Two distinct cultures are found in the area - one Native American, and the other Anglo. The bulk of the Native Americans live on a reservation a few miles out of the village limits, and the majority of Anglos live in the town. The ratio of Native Americans to Anglos is about 30/70. The ethnic makeup of the school population, however, is closer to 50/50. The community sustains itself primarily on agriculture, with some small commercial fishing interests and increasing movement towards tourism. There are relatively few professionals of any type in the community, but this has changed in the last few years with an influx of more young people to this scenic area.

This document represents a summary of the observations, interviews and analysis of the Townville Urban/Rural School Development Program. The name of the community and the names of the various administrative personnel, teachers, and community persons interviewed are ficticious. The site visit occurred in April of 1977.

The report is divided into four major parts. First, the perceptions and impressions of administrators are reviewed; second, those of the teachers, and finally, those of the community. In each case, their impressions of both council process and the teacher education components are reviewed and analyzed. The report concludes with a summary of general impressions across role groups.

PERCEPTIONS OF ADMINISTRATORS ON SCC COUNCIL

Don Brown, District Superintendent

Mr. Brown came to Townsville 17 years ago. At that time, he was the youngest superintendent in the state. He now points out with considerable pride the he, in fact, has the longest tenure of any superintendent in the district. His office is physically open and was a beehive of activity while I was there. Both students and faculty came in and out at will during our discussions. It appeared that there was a genuine sense of respect and warmth for Mr. Brown by his faculty, and he communicated a similar feeling in turn for the teachers.

Mr. Brown perceived the Urban/Rural project as critical to the success of his school district over the last half dozen years. He stated that it was more than just a teacher program. It allowed for consortium, a bringing together of appropriate role groups within the community and that indeed, this consortium, if not parity, per se, had taken hold. He noted that in this particular rural area, a lot of the social turmoil which was manifested in riots and campus uprisings during the 1960's first came to high schools and rural areas such as his, in the 70's, at the time in which the Urban/Rural project was initiated. For example, it was about this time that the Native Americans in his area discovered their "Indianness". This heightened awareness of potential racial problems was combined with a considerable influx of mandates at the state level in terms of rules and regulations that placed considerable demands upon his district. He credited Urban/Rural as the vehicle that allowed them to cope with this. The key to success of Urban/Rural, from his perspective, was a visible administrative support of the project-support, which went beyond rhetoric and continued involvement on his behalf from the beginning. Additionally, there was excellent stability on the council in terms of a core group of both teachers and parents who remain actively involved in the program from its conception. At least five of the current council were on that council in 1970.

While there was little doubt that teachers assumed the dominant role in certain respects on the council, because, in fact, the focus was their own development, certainly the community was involved in a very significant way. He estimated that in his small community that at least 100 persons were directly involved in one way or another during the course of the project. Three factors were noted as contributing to some difficulty in the council process: the heightened racial tension, which was noted earlier, the concern that teachers, through the advanced degrees which they were gaining, were going to cost the community more money than they could afford in terms of salaries, and a perception that Urban/Rural was broader in its focus and should have more of an Urban Renewal focus which in many respects was badly needed in this small community. Nonetheless (not to deny a vocal minority who continually took issue with the project), his impression was that the majority of the community saw considerable value in the project, and in fact, were most likely not aware of the very significant contributions it had made in what he perceived as a difficult time for that district. He illustrated this latter point by pointing out that in a neighboring and somewhat larger school district, problems that had been resolved in Urban/Rural were exaserbated at this time in that district.

With respect to the teacher education component of the project, he felt that much had been accomplished. His perception was that those teachers who wanted benefited a great deal from the project, and this included the majority of teachers. Additionally, he felt that working relationships among teachers had been greatly facilitated by the project. The primary ingredient to the success of the teacher education effort was the on-site resident professors who spent two years in the school. As a result of their efforts, 11 faculty members had completed Master of Arts degrees. He concluded by stating that teachers now have a much more current and broader base of knowledge and are able after this experience, to confront real curriculum and behavioral problems in the schools on their own terms. Faculty are now able, in a collaborative way, to engage in their own continuing development.

He hoped that in some way at some time, the school community council idea could be maintained. "It certainly is a structure that makes more sense than a host of advisory committees dealing with various title acts and special projects that had preceeded it." His impression was that a council even without money, could investigate problems and issues incorporating all the necessary variant perceptions and consensus obtained and priorities set for the teachers of his district. He felt that the issue of higher salaries was burning out in that his staff were not "money grubbers". They were, by and large, very committed people. They spent long hours after school, and he said, "They would be here at 6:00 tomorrow morning for a special meeting if I asked them to be." Urban/Rural had much to do with building this high degree of moral commitment.

Mr. Frazer, Team Manager

Mr. Frazer originally taught in Townville from 1962 to 65, at which time he was a coach, as well as biology teacher. He went from Townville to coaching at the college level and eventually to graduate school, before he returned as team manager in 1970. Mr. Frazer felt that despite his efforts, most unfortunately, the community viewed him as part of a professional staff rather than as a person who could be a community advocate, as he felt he often tried to be.

Mr. Frazer saw an open administration as critical to the success of the school community council. He saw the superintendent's involvement as basically good, in that he was continually involved and supportive of the program. On the other hand, there were obvious problems in that when he took a stance on a particular issue, many people naturally fell in line with him on that position. More importantly, however, was the lack of involvement by the principals. If he were to do it over again, he would insist on the involvement of principals in the training activities. He saw their lack of involvement as a major constraining factor to the success of some of the training efforts in the program. His basic perception was that an awful lot was accomplished in Urban/Rural, yet even more could have been done.

In terms of the council process specifically, he noted that the cultural differences really were not so much white vs. Native American, as much as a basic difference in views between those at and below the poverty level and the working class. Nonetheless, ethnic and cultural differences, for the first time, in the history of that community, from his perspective, were gotten out on the table, and he considered this most healthy. Two other constraints in terms of the school community process were a lack of technical and leadership skills in decision making on the community's part. He pointed out that there was almost a complete absence of professionals in this small community other than those on the faculty. In fact, many people moved to Townville, because they viewed it as a retirement type of settlement. A second basic problem, he felt, in a project such as this, was to clarify more specifically exactly what community participation means. "Does it mean more actual involvement by the community in the school, working with kids? Does it mean greater effort by the school to reach out into the community? Does it mean more involvement by the community in all policy issues having to do with the school? Or does it mean, primarily, more involvement on fundamental dollar issues?" Like the superintendent, he pointed out that regardless of this articulation of just what community participation is, there was very substantive involvement by the community in this project. In fact, he noted when all the different Title Acts, the Indian education committee, the various people who do volunteer work and everything else, was considered, well over a third of the people in the community had some kind of direct involvement with the school. Finally, he pointed out one other condition, which may well be unique to the communities where there is a high Native American population. His perception was that there is a very strong historical Native American value that "no one rises above the norm". Thus, every time there was a major action to move in a new and innovative way, it often generated an equal reaction to maintain the norm. His perception of community involvement was that in a funny kind of way, many people really don't want excellence because of the real fear of demands it will place upon them. This is an interesting note and one that might well be generalizable beyond this specific site. One more factor from his perspective in the relative success or failure of a council was the degree to which the team manager could be seen as an advocate of the community as well as of the school.

With respect to the teacher education component of the project, Mr. Frazer noted that there was a very strong emphasis from the beginning on a movement towards more humanistic practices in the school. This overarching goal was supported both by those in the community and in the school. The fact that early in the project, a more flexible and prolonged time block with students was implemented, helped movement in this direction. The fact that teachers over a two hour period needed to become more personal with their students, made them most receptive to many of the humanistic and interpersonal skills that were stressed early in the program. His position was, given the rather insulated and conservative nature of the staff and community, considerable progress had been made in terms of "opening up" the school. Like the superintendent, he felt that the resident professors who were most supportive of humanistic principles and demonstrated them in their many one-to-one interactions with teachers, were a key to the success that had been achieved. His impression was, however, that they had regressed somewhat in the last two years. This was partly due to a considerable saturation of teacher education efforts in the first three years and the fact that this kind of teacher education places considerable demands upon individuals which go beyond the acquisition of technical teaching skills. In summary, then, while he would have hoped more could have been accomplished in terms of changing the larger structure of the school itself, there was little doubt in his mind that teachers had benefited considerably. In terms of the council, he felt that it was time, in this particular community, that such a structure move out beyond the school to look at total community concerns such as care for the elderly, and inadequate recreational facilities. He felt that the acquisition of some legal status for such a body would be critical to its success in the future. He did not see any coalition of role groups at the present time that would initiate such an effort, but had a hunch that once people realized what they had lost, this may happen in the near future.

TEACHING STAFF

Mr. Johnson, Chairperson, School Community Council

Mr. Johnson has taught in Townville for 15 years. He has served for 6 years on the SCC. The last 3 years, he served as Chair of the Council.

Mr. Johnson was obviously very enthusiastic about Urban/Rural and what it had accomplished. He stated that the project had "a profound effect on him both as a person and a professional". He felt that he had grown during this time immensely as a teacher.

In terms of the SCC, Mr. Johnson noted that they had gotten the community involved initially in two ways: by having community people elect representatives which required persons to state their positions about needs in the school and school community concerns. Second, community were defined as staff in the proposal, and this allowed them to pay community for their participation in their meetings on the basis that they were also involved from time to time in school activities. Mr. Johnson stated that the council itself was not always a bed of roses, but that fundamentally, it had worked very well in terms of the different constituents talking more openly with one another. He perceived initially, very good cooperation, then some problems as questions arose over the role of the council in relation to the role of the school board utself. Once relationships were clarified, there was cooperation and fairly effective functioning towards the end of the project again.

In terms of the teacher education component, his impression was that all staff members who wanted to improve, did improve. He would describe the impact on the staff and school as "dramatic". He related, "kids now like school". He felt they had made considerable progress in moving out of a terribly traditional approach to schooling. Specific outcomes of the project that he enumerated included: an improved grading system, a highly functional learning resource center and a full-time Indian education consultant, who had had impact on the school curriculum in a large number of ways. He underscored that the basic training was not in content, that was not what the faculty needed, but in process and in more effective interpersonal relationships between teachers-students and teachers -teachers and teacher-community. He thought that one key to the success of the project was the continual input of fresh perspectives. These new perspectives were obtained in two basic ways. First, both faculty and community members, who in many ways were quite provincial, had multiple opportunities to visit firsthand other schools and attend meetings and workshops which were helpful. Additionally, there was a continuing source of people who were brought into the building and like the others, he underscored how helpful the resident professors, who remained in the school for two years, were to the teaching staff. In summary, he felt that the basic loss at this time would be that of the SCC. He was most hopeful that some type of form or parallel structure to the SCC could be sustained. He acknowledged that while there were some people who were obviously critical of Urban/Rural, those people who had been most directly involved, now formed a strong core group who are staunch supporters of the school and the goals they were working towards.

Mrs. Smith

Mrs. Smith has taught for 11 years in Townville at the middle and secondary school level. She has been involved in one way or another with the project since its conception.

Mrs. Smith reiterated the remarks of the administrators with respect to the contributions of the council. She did underscore that there was, in the community, to some extent, an anti-teacher atmosphere which seemed to be predicated on the notion that teachers were the upper-class wealthy persons in the community and that they had not done enough for others in the community who were more severely disadvantaged. Her own impression was that it is difficult for her to perceive herself or her colleagues as rich in any sense of the word.

Mrs. Smith preferred to discuss the teacher education aspect of the program. Her opening remark, when I asked her about Urban/Rural, was that "All in all, this is a once in a lifetime experience; everyone benefited, no one escaped". She underscored that because of the impetus on interpersonal relations, attitudes have changed in the school and the current relationship between teachers and students was very healthy. She thought that there was a mutual respect achieved for the first time in her experience in the schools. She noted that obviously the community has not been affected as much - but then again, that wasn't the intent of Urban/Rural - but she had a feeling that perhaps the kids themselves, who were going through this program may in another five or ten years, have an impact that will change the community somewhat. She thought that the key to the program was an effective team manager. She voiced great respect for the team manager in the project. It was important, from her perspective, that this person be a staff person and not a line administrator. Her concept of effective inservice was very much a job-embedded one. "It is essential that teachers have time to sort through their own ideas." She stated, "In this project, we were able to hatch through our problems together and, perhaps most importantly, better discover our own talents and realize that we could resolve many problems that had plagued us for a long time". She underscored the effectiveness of involving total staff in various activities from time to time. She shared two instances where the entire staff was released from school to participate in other activities with students from a nearby college coming in to take over the classes during this time. Her overall impression, then, of Urban/Rural, was mostly favorable, especially in terms of its emphasis on teacher development, she noted less success in terms of the community participation but an acknowledgement that hurdles have been overcome in that area as well.

The third teacher interviewed was Mr. George. Mr. George is a relatively young teacher whose total teaching experience of 7 years was in the fifth grade in Townville. He had served for 3 years as a teacher representative on the SCC. Mr. George, prior to the advent of Urban/Rural, was a temporary teacher on 2-year certificate, and Urban/Rural had allowed him to complete his Bachelor's degree.

In terms of the council itself, he saw the involvement of the community as most beneficial to the school. He underscored that there were two ethnic groups in the community, and as a result of this project, the kids in the school from both cultures were getting along with one another much better. He stated that he was a very reserved person when he started going to council meetings and that the meetings had helped him speak out on positions. He felt that, in fact, many people both on the staff and in the community had come out of their shells and communicated more freely as a result of this process. One of the more interesting observations he made was that he now felt comfortable in separating his professional behavior from his personal behavior - that is, he could argue vehemently about concerns in a meeting of a professional nature, but not let this get in the way of his personal relationships with other people on the staff. He had the impression, as a beginning teacher, that in the past, more experienced teachers had used personal influence to achieve professional ends, which he may or may not have agreed with in the school. Mr. George no longer felt constrained to behave in certain ways in the school because of perceived peer pressure.

His impression was that there was good balance and parity in the actual council process. He stated, "No one person dominated. The council chair served as a referree. Both he and the superintendent were straightforward and made their views known, but at the same time, were facilitative and honest". He did not feel that the community was intimidated in any way on the SCC. In fact, his impression was that teachers bent over backwards to respect the community's point of view. This attempt not to intimidate the non-professional in any way in fact caused some problems as there were teachers who grew weary of trying to accommodate the community and felt that the community didn't put forth as much effort in trying to understand the teacher's point of view. Nonetheless, overall he felt that the SCC was a vital and significant element of the project and contributed considerably to the improvement of the school.

He stated, like the other, that the result of the inservice was the improved climate and attitudes of students and faculty in the school. "You have to remember," he reminded me, "that in the past, we used very traditional and harsh forms of discipline around here. Kids were physically threatened and bounced around." He stated that kids were very much surprised at the change in in the faculty and, as a result over the years, became much more involved in their school work. He reiterated what others had said, that "kids like it here now". He also noted that the Native American population had benefited considerably in terms of the more informal and relaxed atmosphere in the school. He said, "As you probably know, there is 'Indian time'. That is, there's a time - a time to do something is when you feel like doing it. If a meeting is scheduled at 9:00, many of the Native American population would arrive at 9:30

or 9:45. The more relaxed atmosphere, then, was very helpful in reducing perceived pressures on the part of Indian students". He shared with me that repeatedly students sided with teachers when it came to showdown issues on the SCC, and he thought one reason for this was that students were appreciative of the changes in the school and the efforts teachers were making to try to better relate to them. He also shared his considerable appreciation for the considerable infusion of new ideas and fresh perspectives and felt that projects like Urban/Rural are badly needed, especially in more rural and isolated areas.

COMMUNITY

Mr. Ryan

Mr. Ryan was the original chairman of the school community council and held this position for 3 years. He eventually removed himself from the council, because a certain element in the community painted him as pro-staff and not as supportive of community as they thought he should have been. He stated that from his perspective, this was hardly the case, but perhaps 3 years was long enough in that position. He now is working in the county as a social psychiatrist, and acknowledged that his role as a professional may have contributed to the perceptions of some in the community that he was a staff person.

When asked about the overall effect of Urban/Rural, he responded, "Putting three quarters of a million dollars into a small rural community is like an atomic bomb going off". He said that a federal program of this stature was bound to galvanize all types of concerns - legitimate and illegitimate within the community. His feeling, however, is that the conflict and antagonism which had been brought out into the open was inevitable. While at times, it was a real free-for-all and no fun, in the final analysis, much had been accomplished, and communication and relationships were now improved. His impression was, while some of the latent problems in the community (as pointed out by the superintendent earlier), contributed to some difficult times, certainly the council process and the increased involvement of groups accomplished much. He downplayed the idea that there was a concern about the teachers having gained, at the expense of the community. He said that perspective is a minority one and basically, is a trap. These teachers were going to accumulate more credits and higher salaries regardless of Urban/Rural. Like everyone else, they are unionized and they negotiate. What Urban/Rural probably did was allow them a much better quality of education in terms of credits they would have taken elsewhere.

As a person trained in social psychiatry, he shared how impressed he was by what happened when a group of school-community persons leave on a retreat for 2 or 3 days. "You really get inside one another's skins if you spend enough time together with people. Formalities are dropped, and many real problems and issues are dealt with." While some may question the expense incurred on some of the trips that were taken, from his perspective, it would be difficult to measure the profound impact they had on many individuals, both in the school and in the community. He summarized by saying that the faculty had changed in terms of its basic posture towards what schooling was - that they were more professionally responsible and more able to relate to students in the teaching-learning process and that this would not subside easily, if at all. Urban/Rural had made a significant contribution to Townville.

Mrs. Nelson

Mrs. Nelson is a community member whose husband is a trucker. They have 6 children, 5 of which are in the Townville school. She has had no formal relationship with Urban/Rural, but has volunteered her time without reimbursement for a number of years as a teacher aide and is quite familiar with the internal workings of the school. Her impression of the council process was that it was basically dominated by the professionals. She stated that this should not be surprising, however, as this small rural community with a limited number of highly educated people has a "basic inferiority complex". Her perception, then was that since there were not enough influential people in the community or not enough people who felt comfortable in articulating their concerns, that the council process was somewhat one-sided. She said, to some extent, there have been some negative spinoffs from Urban/Rural in terms of school-community relationships. For example, since teachers have now gotten advance degrees, this is a sore point, especially in a small town that is severely economically disadvantaged. She thought it would have helped if the benefits that would have been accrued to teachers would have been spelled out more in more detail at the outset of the program. She also noted that the emphasis on multicultural concerns may, in some way, have widened the gap between the two cultures. She put it this way, "In the past, my impression is that we didn't have double standards in our community, and now there is this feeling that one has to bend over backwards. I think this has created some mixed-up feelings with some of the white children". This impression was consistent with the general theme of hers that there was too much emphasis on "beads and folklore" and not enough on hard academics, such as French and Latin. She acknowledged that the attitudes of faculty and the atmosphere of the school had improved greatly, but that the academics still were not high in this particular rural community. "That is not to say that it didn't help, it just didn't help enough." She acknowledged that this problem was not entirely the responsibility of the school. "The community," she stated, "will support concrete visible success, like a winning basketball team, but as a community, rarely speak out on more fundamental issues such as uplifting academic standards." By the same token, she said the community does have somewhat higher expectations at this time, but perhaps for the wrong reason. For example, since there is now carpeting on the floors and there has been much more intensive training with more degrees, the community expects better results.

When asked about the teacher education aspect, she stated that she was primarily positive about what had been accomplished. Certainly, good teachers were now better. On the other hand, lousy teachers were probably still lousy. She made an interesting point in that this kind of program is not really an incentive program for the poor teacher. In fact, the poor teacher and his/her lack of standards are probably ignored in the excitement and hustle and bustle which draws attention away from them and focuses on the good things that are being accomplished by others. She stated that it is probably difficult for many in the community to realize that many good things have been accomplished in the school. When 750 thousand dollars is put into a small community, the expectations for improvement throughout the community are very high. Certainly, in programs of this type, more leadership training for people in the community especially a community like hers, would be critical. She warned about the effects of sophisticated and comprehensive needs assessment. Her impression was that when you assess a lot of needs or talk to a lot of people and get a lot of ideas, you have to remember that there's no way all of those are going to be implemented, and this is going to leave a residue of some hard feelings. What probably happened is exemplified by her case. That is, one who is enlightened can and will use such a project. She stated, "I used Urban/Rural, and I benefited from it. I am now a better parent and a better teacher aide. It's too bad that we didn't have the wherewithall to involve more people in such a way."

Mrs. Blue Eagle

Mrs. Blue Eagle is a mother of four. She and her husband run a dairy farm. Her husband is also town supervisor. All of their children attend the Townville schools. Mrs. Blue Eagle reiterated the concern of the other community members that in many respects, community people felt intimidated by the professionals. There was a stable segment of school people who stayed with the project from its inception, while community participation was much more transient. She attributed this transiency to some frustration on community members' parts of not being able to cope with the faculty. She noted, however, that this is not because the school people didn't try, merely that this is a very difficult thing when you have wide gaps in the education of people. While a member of the minority culture in the community herself, she stated that the real division in the community was between the poor and the uneducated and the more wealthy and educated. She stayed with the council from the very beginning until the completion of the project and in many ways, felt that others in the community labeled her as "co-opted" by the school, because she tried to maintain an objective stance about the process. She also noted that part of the "intimidation" of the community came from the fact that not only were the local school people more educated, but there was a large infusion of other specialists, experts and external resources who the community found more difficult to deal with as well. With respect to the teacher education component of the project, she felt that it had accomplished a considerable amount of good.

Certainly, the humanistic training did help many teachers. In some cases, it appeared to have a profound effect on individuals. In other cases, it really made little difference. One of the observations that she made was about the quality of teacher education provided. She was concerned, for example, that she was given an 'A' in a course that she took where she did next to nothing in terms of work. Her point was that very often, glamor and excitement are passed off for hard work and quality in terms of trying to improve teachers in schools. One of the reservations that she expressed is, "that it dosen't appear that teachers have really made that much more effort physically to try to get into the community and into students' homes". She stated that this may be because of the cultural differences and that most white teachers just don't feel comfortable in the reservation area. She concluded by saying she thought that the school had a more wholesome and open atmosphere and that certainly it is more sensitive to the concerns of the Native Americans and suspects that it will remain so in the future. She thought that the charge that teachers had feathered their own nests was unfair. When she looked at the project as objectively as she could, she concluded that, in fact, many in the community may have ripped off the program more than the staff.

Mrs. Beaver

Mrs. Beaver is a mother of 8. She has long been active in both the schools and the tribal council. She was originally involved on the SCC but has not really invested energies in the school system during the last three or four years. She admitted to being tired, to having put in an enormous amount of time and energy into the school and the communities over the years. She also admitted that she was an outspoken person, but unfortunately, there were not enough like her in the community and certainly, in the Native American community. She did not perceive the community as basically divided by a white Indian culture. She stated, "I think of myself as an individual first, and of my culture second. If more Indians would get off their damn asses, more of the problems around here would take care of themselves". Her impressions of the school community council were that that element of the program probably had limited success. She saw the community overall as unusual in that people were quite conservative and tending not to get involved. It would have surprised her if the various factions in the community could have been overcome to any large extent by a structure such as the school community council.

On the other hand, she thought that some good changes had come about in the schools. Certainly, teachers learned a lot, but she added, "They could learn a lot more". There had been, for the first time, some real intensive efforts to try to deal more effectively with the Native American community, but again, there still was a long way to go in this respectl She thought one of the basic benefits of the program was that it helped a number of people in the community, including people like herself to get out of their own culture and to get a better perspective of what the rest of the world was really like. She underscored that one of the problems with bringing large federal grants into a small community is that when they leave, they have to be careful that many things may not be able to be sustained. There is very little money in the community and unless the money invested at the time of the project will speak to problems that can be resolved without requiring additional funds afterwards, the money, in many cases, may have been ill advised. Her overall impression was that the program was worth it, that it was timely in terms of when it came to the community and that, if it were done again, they would have learned a lot that could make the process work better.

In summary, then, the Urban/Rural project in Townville seemed to have accomplished a considerable amount. While it does not appear to have significantly changed school-community relations and in fact, some feel it may have further constrained them, the majority opinion seems to be that the community at large views the school in a much more positive light at this time. The basic problems in school-community relationships appear to be economic, and the fact that there is a perception by many that the teachers are the economic elite in the community: Urban/Rural benefited them and not the community as such, was a theme repeated by many. It would seem that those in the community who wanted to benefit from Urban/Rural and had the confidence and initiative to do so, certainly accomplished what they wanted. One of the other generalizations frequently echoed is that it is important in a project of this scope in a small rural area to articulate very explicitly just what the project can and cannot do for the community. Apparently, many perceive the project as having more of an urban renewal emphasis than was intended in this case. It was also pointed out that it is extremely important to articulate as precisely as possible just what community participation in relationship to the school is, that such participation can take place on several levels and call for varying degrees of "parity".

Certainly, the project was seen by the majority involved as successful in terms of having a rather permeating and profound impact on the climate of the school. Once again, those teachers who wanted to benefit from the program, appear to have gained considerably. Those teachers who were interviewed gave the impression of being much more self sufficient in terms of their own continuing development and being more comfortable in terms of dealing with both their colleagues and the students in the school. The resident professors being integrated for an extended period of time into the ongoing activities of the school, were an obvious high point of the project. Additionally, the variety of means that were used to free faculty to work on their own problems was perceived most favorably. Finally, the many efforts to bring new perspectives to the faculty by both getting them out of the local community and bringing in a rich variety of resources were acknowledged by everyone interviewed.

BETA 1
U/R SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM
(A CASE STUDY)

This document represents a summary of the observations and analysis of the BETA 1, Urban/Rural School Development Project. It is part of the documentation and evaluation phase of the Urban/Rural School Development Program being performed by the Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching. The site visit occurred in April of 1977.

Community Characteristics

This project is situated in the south eastern part of the country. The school district where the U/R program resides serves the entire county, and provides educational programs for approximately 2,200 children, and employs approximately 115 professionals. The educational programs are provided in three centralized school campuses, one elementary, one middle school, and one high school.

The community is predominantly rural, though in recent years, partially through the efforts of the Model Cities Project, some industry has been enticed to establish plants in the area. Currently, there is one large plant and several smaller plants.

Approximately 40% of the student population of the school district comes from homes that are officially designated as below the poverty level. Sixty per cent of the county adults have not received a high school diploma. The mean school years completed is 8.6 as contrasted with 10.8 for the state. School officials suggest that this low educational attainment reflects a continued out-migration of the more highly skilled and better educated youth from the area.

Approximately 70% of the students attending the county schools are below national levels in reading, while slightly less than that fall below national norms on the standardized mathematics test.

School officials report that the county residents are 83 per cent white and 17 per cent black. Further, they describe the community as low income with a high percentage of the residents on welfare, but not with a high unemployment rate. It appears that most of the vocational opportunities in the county yield a very low wage.

Respondents

In all, nine interviews were held, with the respondents representing program administration, school district administration, school district faculty, and community. All of those interviewed were members of the School Community Council.

The team manager has held her position in the program for approximately two years. She is the fourth team manager, and prior to her involvement with the Urban-Rural Project, she was a School Community Council member, a teacher in the school district, and has held other administrative positions. The School Community Council chairperson, who has held the position since the program's inception, is a district administrator. Four teachers were interviewed, representing the high school, the middle school, the elementary school, and the special education program. Their tenure on the School Community Council has ranged from one to six years. Both of the community representatives who were interviewed have been involved with Urban/Rural since its inception. Both women are former teachers and long-term citizens of this community. One of them is a member of the County Board of Education. Finally, the superintendent was interviewed. Although not intimately connected with program development and management, his knowledge of the program was extensive and he was able to offer a context in which to better understand the six years of Urban/Rural in this community.

The School Community Council Process

In order to better understand the various perceptions of the parity process that is required in an Urban/Rural Project, the discussions will focus on three separate role groups. These role groups include administrators (both program and school district), teachers, and community representatives. Preceding the analysis by role groups, the common features of the parity process, those noted by all respondents, will be discussed.

The School Community Council has met on a regular basis (usually once per month) during the entire tenure of the program. Occasionally, if special topics or needs arose, special meetings are convened. Typically, meetings are held at the Board of Education office in the early evening.

According to nearly all respondents, the meetings follow a carefully pre-set agenda, usually organized by the team manager in conjunction with the School Community Council chairperson. It was pointed out that any School Community Council member can put an item on the agenda for either discussion or for action. Typically, however, the agenda items originate with the team manager.

The School Community Council meetings usually operate under the auspices of a loosely set of rules. On some occasions, when the decisions to be made are universally acceptable, a consensus type agreement is reached. On other occasions, more formalized motions are made, discussions are held, and votes are taken. It was pointed out by representatives from all role groups that on many topics there are clear differences of opinion and clear debates. Furthermore, it was pointed out that one could not predict the outcome of a decision based solely on the role groups of those supporting and opposing it. At times, the school and project administration prevailed and on other occasions they voted on the losing side, Nearly all respondents viewed the process as open, free spirited, and at times unpredictable.

The team manager as well as the other administrators viewed the School Community Council as the organization which deals with overarching policies and/or with specific exceptions in problemmatic areas. Generally, administrative representatives saw the team manager as possessing a great deal of freedom to make programmatic decisions and to implement those decisions. It was pointed out on several occasions that the team manager does, however, have an obligation to report back to the School Community Council and to keep them informed as to ongoing activities. According to the team manager then, the Council approves proposals and establishes the travel and programmatic guidelines. Additionally, the Council has established the commitment to community education, as well as the guidelines for contracting with colleges and universities. The team manager has been given both the right and the responsibility to develop programs consistent with these guidelines and policies. This type of arrangement for dealing with the School Community Council-administrative responsibilities is viewed by the administrators to be both necessary and operationally feasible. It is viewed as a workable system for operating a program within the constraints of a council that is not part of the established structure of the school system.

The teachers on the School Community Council clearly believe that the Council has credibility within the school system. They attribute a good deal of that credibility to the accessibility and support given the team manager. It was stated on more than one occasion that the current team manager is clearly the most acceptable of all who have held that position. It was noted in discussions with the teachers that at times it is difficult to obtain a quorum at a School Community meeting, and that the community is not very active in the process. Concerning the latter observations, it was pointed out that the community representatives are more "middle-class" than representative of the poor citizens of the county. It was stressed, however, that the programs that have developed out of the Urban/Rural Project have been beneficial to all children. There seemed to be, on the part of teachers, an honest desire to enhance community involvement in the process. They were quick to point out the numerous efforts that have been made toward that end. These efforts included flyers from school, face to face contact with community residents, advertisements and stories in the local newspaper, and frequent notices over the local radio station.

The community representatives on the School Community Council also attested to the credibility of the Council, the process, and the resultant programs. These representatives viewed the problems that have occurred over the tenure of the Council to, in many cases, be directly attributable to involvement of either regional or federal representatives or lack of support from the Leadership Training Institute. Both were quick to acknowledge the paucity of community involvement in the school-community process. They also stressed the number of concentrated efforts that have been made in an effort to enlist more community support and community involvement. They did point out that in the last two years, there has been a distinct upward trend in the development of community education programs and they view this to be helpful in establishing better community contact. Interestingly, the community representative pointed out that it is difficult for many poor community members who are farmers to attend meetings at the expense of performing the necessary chores associated with their livelihood. Although there has been a limited community involvement, it was not felt by either the community respondents or the other respondents that there exists much, if any, antagonism toward the Urban/Rural Project in the community. Rather, they view a community ignorance of the program and its goals, despite the efforts that have been made to enlighten and involve the community in program activities as well as the School Community Council.

In summary, it appears that the School Community Council here, has functioned in accordance with guidelines associated with the Urban/Rural Program. All required constituencies have been involved, and there is a clear perception that those who have been active in the School Community Council have had an impact. Clearly, all respondents perceive the School Community Council to be potent and to have actual authority in policy making concerning program activities. When asked if the program would have operated differently had there been no School Community Council, virtually every respondent declared that it would have. In fact, on more than one occasion, School Community Council members suggested that if the Council had not existed, there is a strong likelihood that many of the resources of the Urban-Rural Program would have been used in support of athletic activities and facilities. Additionally, more than one Council member suggested that the resources that have been devoted to do community education activities would have been diverted to more school-related programming.

Teacher Training Programs

Virtually every interviewee saw the teacher training programs that have occurred within the county school district as the single most positive benefit of the Urban/Rural Project. Although respondents emphasized the recently developed community education programs, there was a universal and strongly stated conviction that the basic intent of Urban/Rural has been teacher education, and that, in fact, the teacher education programs have been the highlight of the project. An aside that was highlighted by two administrators was the fact that the existence of the Urban/Rural Project in the county had presented them with a very valuable recruiting and retention tool for teachers. In essence, teachers have been able to take free courses that allowed them to achieve certification and to receive advanced degrees. Although specific statistics could not be gathered, many of the respondents pointed out that nearly all of the teachers in the school district have masters degrees, a condition which does not exist in neighboring counties.

At the onset of the Urban/Rural Project five and a half years ago, virtually all the programs were teacher education. It has been during the last two years that the School Community Council has branched out into the community education programs. It should be noted that this has not occurred at the expense of the teacher education programs, but rather that both types of educational programming has occurred side by side and there apparently have been no negative feelings concerning this condition. It was estimated that about one-fourth of the programs now developed (or perhaps one-fourth of the resources devoted) are in the community education areas.

The bulk of the teacher education programs that have occurred in the Urban/Rural Project have been of the traditional course mode, and have emerged from contracts with either of the two universities. They have been established in accordance with polls taken of the teachers, and reflect teacher needs both in terms of desired skills and degree/certification requirements. It was the general consensus of the respondents that this type of teacher education programming, although helpful, was quite conventional. It was pointed out on numerous occasions, hwoever, that the closest institution of higher education to BETA 1, is approximately ninety miles. When one considers this in regard to the fact that the contracts provided for the courses to be offered on site, it is easy to understand why even these conventional programs were viewed to be a major benefit.

During the middle phase of the six-year program (years 3 and 4), there was a good deal of innovation in the teacher training programs that emerged from the Urban-Rural Project. For two years, the contract established with a State University provided "live-in" professors in all content areas. On occasion, there were three resident professors, but in most cases, only two. Not only did these resident professors teach traditional courses, but they spent a good deal of time doing individual and small group consulting as well as demonstrations of teaching and other "hands-on" teacher education activities. It should be noted that with something more than 100 teachers in the school district, even two or three full-time teacher education faculty can provide a high level of service for any teachers desiring help.

In addition to the "live-in" professors, Urban/Rural resources have been used to hire curriculum coordinators that have also served as job-embedded teacher educators. These consultants have operated in the areas of math and reading and have been viewed by most of the School Community Council members who were interviewed as being extremely helpful. Currently, plans are being made to maintain at least one of these consultants at the termination of this program. It was pointed out by more than on respondent that the curriculum consultants that are hired by the district, either the local district or the regional school service agency, possess the benefit of being a "hands-on" inservice teacher educator without the liability of being constrained with university rules, regulations, and status problems. The general consensus of School Community Council members seems to be that the locally hired curriculum consultants are probably more workable than are resident university professors. However, it was also pointed out that there is a great deal of difficulty arranging to have the locally hired curriculum consultants teach courses for university credit, and that this benefit was sorely missed in some cases.

On the whole, both the resident university faculty as well as the curriculum consultants were seen by the teacher representatives of the School Community Council to be the most satisfying aspect of the program. Interestingly, these two sources of inservice teacher education programs were also seen by other School Community Council members as being the most valuable. When one considers that this phenomena occurred for over two years and to a lesser degree is still occurring, one can note that there exists a clear cut example of job embedded inservice education that has worked. On the national scene, instances of this type are extremely rare.

Another programmatic benefit that was viewed by all parties to be important is the travel benefits that are associated with the Urban/Rural Project. Those interviewed were very sensitive to the fact that this county is an isolated rural area with a limited access to many social, cultural, and professional events. The travel funds made possible by the Urban/Rural Project have helped create a situation where not only teachers and administrators, but also selected community participants can travel to various professional meetings in other parts of the country. The School Community Council members who were interviewed felt, and this writer would agree, that the travel benefit of a program such as Urban-Rural is probably greater for an isolated rural region like this county than it might be to other areas that are less isolated from the professional mainstream. Although respondents noted that many aspects of the Urban/Rural Project will be missed after the termination, a few confided to this writer that the travel benefits may well be the most noticeable loss. This is particularly true when one considers that many of the teachers in the district have already completed their terminal certification and advanced degree requirements, thus making many of the teacher training programs less attractive now then they were at the onset of the program six years ago.

Interestingly, as the respondents were quizzed concerning the use of resources for program development that might not otherwise have been available, few related that much money has been devoted to the acquisition of materials and supplies for either teachers or for children. It was pointed out by the team manager that other projects have been used to acquire educational materials, thus freeing up Urban/Rural funds for teacher training projects, community education programs, and travel. When the teachers were queried concerning the need for more materials, they pointed out that there seemed to be an adequate flow of materials into the school district. One teacher did note that Urban/Rural funds were used to purchase some rather expensive surveying equipment - made available through mini-grants to teachers.

In sum, it appears that the BETA 1, Urban/Rural Project has devoted a good deal of effort and probably a majority of their resources to the development of various types of teacher education programs. Although there has been the development of a great number of more conventional courses for advanced degrees and certification, there also has been a significant amount of innovation focusing on job-embedded inservice delivered by resident professors from the state university as well as by locally employed consultants. It is also important to note that all respondents view the ongoing inservice provided by full-time personnel as the most beneficial and the most satisfying. Travel as well as the development of community-based education are also seen as programmatic developments that would not have occurred without the existence of the Urban/Rural Project. In a sense, the BETA 1, Urban/Rural Project has been very active in program development and appears to have operated in an attempt to implement the intent of the program.

Observations and Summary

As the writer perused the notes taken during the visit to this site, in an effort to develop a coherent synthesis, it did become apparent that the Urban/Rural Project had developed the type of structural parity that was intended by the program planners at the federal level. All constituent role groups are involved. All are either elected or selected in an open and rational fashion. The Council has met regularly and has made the majority of decisions relating to program policy and program development. A workable and productive arrangement between the Council and program management has evolved. There appears to be little doubt that those involved in the BETA 1, Urban/Rural Project took their charges seriously.

It also appears that, at least at one level, the notion of parity worked. There can be little doubt that the community and teacher participants on the School Community Council perceive themselves to be equal members of the group that rendered the important policy and program decisions. It should, however, be pointed out that this process operates within the social context of a rural county school district in the south eastern part of the United States. That context must be considered as one analyzes and dares to evaluate the process that has occurred. The social context of this town, is not the context of Washington, D.C., New York City, or even Moosejaw, Ontario. Thus, it is entirely possible that the frame of reference an analytical visitor brings to the situation could inadvertantly impact his evaluative statements.

It is also apparent that the Urban/Rural Project at this site has developed many teacher education programs - both conventional and innovative. Conversations with the personnel associated with the programs quite openly lead this writer to believe that some were successful while others were not so successful. In many cases, the reasons for the development of the programs was both the improvement of teacher skills as well as the development of courses with course credits that would aid the teachers in obtaining both higher level certificates and advanced college degrees. In other cases, there is evidence of job-embedded inservice focusing exclusively on individual teacher needs and problems as defined by those teachers, and providing in-classroom, hands-on support and training.

In recent years, there has also been a programmatic thrust toward the development of community based programs. Ranging all the way from basic ceramics and knitting to the support of a visit by a well known ballet troupe, the Urban/Rural Project's School Community Council members are proud of their endeavors. It also was made clear that if there is any facet of the program that the School Community Council members would like to continue, it would be the development of more, better, and more diversified community education programs. Although there appears to be no desire to limit the development of teacher education programs, the desire to enhance the community education programs is probably the result of a very real need in this town. It also must be considered possible that because so many teachers have received higher level certificates and degrees that teacher education programs are not seen as necessary at the present time.

An analysis of both the notes taken by the site visitor as well as his own personal observations of the project and community during the two-day visit, at least two "clinical" type observations seem appropriate. First, parity in educational program development is a situation-specific phenemenon. Conversely stated, there can be no concept of "absolute parity" that can be reasonably, accurately, and productively applied across all educational sites in a society as diverse as ours. When one considers that most of the professional staff and the community are life-long residents of an isolated rural community, then it is apparent that the social relationships will be very different in a parity council than they would be if the constituents were more culturally diverse, such as one would find in a major urban setting. Nearly all members of the School Community Council have known each other for years, and have known each other in contexts that transcend the School Community Council. In some cases they are close friends. There exists, although this writer does not thoroughly understand it, a communication system that precludes overt confrontation and conflict as a viable problem solving strategy. Within the context of this community, the School Community Council has worked and parity does exist.

A second observation focuses on the development of programs that have emerged from the Urban/Rural Project. It suggests that utilizing local norms and left to local devices, both teacher education and community education programs will develop that are responsive to the perceived needs of those involved. This will occur even though the needs are not articulated formally or precisely. Yet, the programs that develop are often unique, innovative, and in some cases appear to be ahead of many of the "more forward" communities where one might look for leadership in program development.

It seems, then, that the Urban/Rural Project at this site, has achieved parity. One can question the involvement of low income community residents in the process and the best analysis is that they have not been highly involved. However, the bottom line in the program development in teacher education as it relates to an Urban/Rural Project is whether or not the programs that have emerged have, in fact, been beneficial to children. It is the perception of those involved in the BETA 1, Urban/Rural Project that this has occurred. This writer would not question that appraisal.

BETA 2
U/R SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM
(a case study)

Background

The responses reported were collected by a single researcher who spent two (2) days conducting in-depth interviews with nine (9) SCC members at an U/R project in the southeastern quarter of the United States, in June of 1977.

An open-ended schedule was used; the questions posed essentially were directed at three (3) programmatic aspects of U/R:

1. SCC Organization: How was the SCC originally formed and how over time did they function with respect to the formulation of policy based on pluralistic, local school-community needs?
2. Program Development: Were the development programs relevant to the identified needs and how successful were they in terms of gaining the support and participation of school personnel and community members?
3. Utilization of Training: What happened to the training once it was applied within the three (3) schools, and to what extent was the training effective in bringing about improvements in curriculum, teaching, technology, etc.?

Nine individuals were interviewed, eight (8) during the time spent at the project and one (1) interview was conducted by telephone. The average interview lasted 1½ hours. No interview took less than 45 minutes, and three (3) required more than two (2) hours to complete. Every interview was conducted in private, at a location chosen by the interviewee. On only one occassion was more than one person interviewed during the single, uninterrupted sessions. The exception was the session at which two professionals, an elementary teacher and a school administrator, were interviewed simultaneously. One interview was conducted by telephone. All nine (9) interviewees are presently members of the SCC. The interviewer relied on note-taking in every case as the method for recording the information.

The Interviewees

What follows are sketches of the nine (9) individuals who provided information for the study. With respect to selection, the Team Manager was requested by the LTI to select as interviewees a cross-section of individuals all of whom would be either SCC members or informed others. All the interviewees were caucasians; characteristically, all were "locals" who were natives of the state, born and raised in or near this county.

Interviewee #1

The initial interview involved a young community woman (35-40 years old) who has been a member of the SCC for four (4) years. She is employed by a social service agency in a professional role. Two of her children are currently enrolled in U/R project schools.

Interviewee #2

The second community representative has been on the SCC since its inception six (6) years ago. A male approximately 50-55 years old, he is also an active member of the Chamber of Commerce. Extremely articulate and well-traveled, he views himself and the others on the SCC as being civic leaders for whom the U/R program has provided an additional and potent avenue for expressing views as they pertain most generally to community development and more specifically to the improvement of local school programs.

Interviewee #3

A school administrator for the past two years at the high school, this soft-spoken, middle-aged man was born and raised in the state and has been an educator for more than a quarter of a century. He has been a council member for the past two (2) years. In his opinion, he has seen definite, positive changes in his staff which are linked to the effects of the professional training supplied through the U/R program.

Interviewee #4

Another "local", this woman has been an elementary teacher for twelve (12) years and a council member for more than three (3) years. She is viewed by others to be a dominant figure within her school and an advocate for school reform.

Interviewee #5

A council member for only one (1) year (1976-77), this woman has been a teacher aid in the county Special Education program for the past three (3) years.

Interviewee #6

A high-ranking county administrator, this middle-aged man has been involved in U/R since its inception. He has been the county person most thoroughly involved in the program, and it is largely through him that the SCC has maintained an ongoing relationship with county officials and Board of Education members.

Interviewee #7

A man in his early 20's, the SCC Chairman has been a resident of the site township since 1969. Serving as a SCC member for only six (6) months before his election a year ago to the SCC position, he is a professional employed in the high school.

Interviewee #8

For eleven years this man has served as an elected member of the county Board of Education. Perhaps the only county board member who has systematically been involved in U/R through periodic attendance at council meetings, he is fully informed (through both formal and informal contacts) about the ongoing interests and activities of the SCC.

Interviewee #9

The Team Manager for the past year, this man first became involved as a SCC member six (6) years ago when he served as an Asst. Principal at the high school. The fifth Team Manager in as many years, he'll return as high school Principal this year and may move to the county office shortly thereafter, assuming responsibility for special programs.

The Responses

Responding to a series of questions, each interviewee was asked to share their knowledge of the council, its history, its operations and its relationships with other agencies and with individuals. Stressing changes over time and critical events, the interviewer was able to draw upon the differing vantages of the nine (9) individuals in order to assemble what appears to be a varyingly accurate picture of 1) the council as an entity, 2) its formulation, 3) its internal operations and 4) its membership.

A less clear picture emerged with respect to the domains of program development and training utilization. Less stable in nature, these aspects of the project were less uniformly recounted by the interviewees, perhaps because the former is a process which is easily transformed at any of several decision points. Questions about the utilization of training produced the least definitive responses, most probably because the activity itself is the least public and unstable element of the program.

What follows is a topically organized synthesis of the information provided through the interview process. Inferences based upon this information are reported separately in the concluding section of the report.

BETA 2

Community Characteristics

The narrative previously written by this writer based on the LTI files ought to provide a fairly good picture of the demographic context.

The two (2) day visit provided an amplification of my impressions of the locale. Rural and isolated, surrounded by a succession of low, green hills which command the "hollows" below them, this site is in a tiny town threaded by a single major street along which businesses are located. A slow moving vehicle enters and exits the town within the space of 2-3 minutes. Within walking distance of the bridge which connects this town to a much larger city, the interviewer spent most of his time in the community center and in the U/R office located across the street. On the few occasions when trips were made for the purpose of conducting interviews, the researcher was able to experience first-hand the difficulty of road travel through an area in which ones closest "neighbor" may reside 10-15 minutes away along circuitous, narrow and poorly maintained roads. Poverty is very real and within a few miles of the U/R office, one is easily able to discern the abject poverty associated with "poor whites". Log cabins, out houses, chickens on the porches.. this visible testimony triggers an immediate awareness that U/R here interacted with classic rural poverty in a region where economic differences among people reduce almost everyone to a relative position of being clearly either a "have" or a "have not".

The SCC

One becomes aware immediately of the often voiced opinion that the SCC is now and has always been comprised almost entirely of relatively well-to-do, socially influential people. In every case but two, interviewees felt that the SCC had been unable to attract as members individuals from the poorest sub-communities. The explanations varied, but the concensus was that the poorest community is generally unable to work in an organized manner toward slowly realized goals. Instead, it is felt that they seek quick and often untenable solutions to problems. Whatever the reasons, it is quite likely that certain of the very poorest people never embraced (or were embraced by?) the U/R program with respect to SCC membership.

A second commonly-held view is that in the early years of the program (1971-73) the SCC was "much more agressive" than during the later years, owing to the early involvement of several extremely vocal and contentious community people who utilized the SCC as a platform from which criticisms regarding teachers were forcefully and openly leveled. Related to this, there appears to be a division over the issue of whether or not the SCC has ever been able to bring professionals and lay people together for the genuine and express purpose of improving schools. On one hand, it is felt by some that at times some teachers overcame their alienation from the council and abused the program by joining the SCC only as a means of promoting a particularistic idea or need. Once assured of getting what they sought, these individuals then quit, some returning periodically whenever a new particularistic need could be met by the SCC. On the other hand, several interviewees cited difficulties in attracting community people to serve on the council, particularly the "hill" people who are among the poorest and least formally educated individuals in the community. Just as some noted that in the early years teachers were reluctant to associate themselves with the SCC, other times during the course of the interviews it was mentioned that the council at times has appeared uninterested in sustaining and revitalizing itself through the admission of new community members. The harshest view depicts the SCC as an exclusive club decidedly uninterested in opening itself up to the scrutiny of others. Less extreme but similar in tone was the more often expressed opinion that the SCC was originally composed of the most active civic leaders, and that for unexplainable reasons, the council has characteristically attracted new members closely resembling in status and outlook those who initially chose to become SCC members during the early and formative years of the program.

Perhaps because the project was embedded within a small community where one's business and behavior are subject to intense scrutiny, the SCC seems to have managed to function outside the existing structure while carefully avoiding placing itself into direct conflict with other agencies and individuals. This harmony was noted by several interviewees, and no instance could be recalled when the SCC was charged with usurping the powers and perogatives of other groups.

Judging from the responses, it might be said that the overriding factors which account for the apparent lack of acrimony between the council and other groups are related to the geographic isolation of the BETA 2 community and the scrupulousness with which the council deliberately avoided antagonizing potentially powerful others.

As for the former, the site is sufficiently physically distant from the county seat, where the Board of Education meets and where most of its members reside, that county officials rarely attended SCC meetings, although one is convinced that the several administrators who sat as council members most certainly were used by the board and county school officials as sources of information regarding council activities. More than once it was explained to me that the county seat dominates county politics, including the operations of schools. Board members are almost exclusively from the populous, northern end of the county, and it was felt that the happenings forty miles away at the site were remote and perhaps went relatively unnoticed by LEA officials.

With respect to the avoidance of conflict, the concensus was that the SCC had carefully avoided contravening established norms, particularly in terms of its advocacy for or endorsement of reforms. Probably every interviewee affirmed in one way or another the view of one individual who stated that the "SCC didn't have to scratch anyone's back" in order to survive as a viable entity. However, several people indicated that the council astutely avoided coming into direct conflict with particular influence groups, especially church groups. By and large, one must believe the authenticity of the view that political power in this site county is concentrated within a small and recognizable clique and that the SCC chose consciously to minimize the chances of running afoul of the county and precinct level power brokers. It was said by one respondent that "People keep their mouths shut in this county"; another felt that generally it was "a hands off attitude toward the council" because the SCC almost always managed to confine itself to policies and programs which didn't threaten those in a position to subvert the council. No interviewee was willing to reveal the names of the people in such positions, and this subject was not pressed.

The combined effects of physical distance and the decision to avoid political antagonisms allowed the SCC to function with what seems to have been a great deal of autonomy within certain latitudes permitted by circumstances.

The conditions under which the SCC first began operating six (6) years ago were less than ideal. There was controversy over the selection of the site township as opposed to an even smaller, more isolated community twenty miles away. Once the county school officials chose this site, the Federal facilitator aggravated the situation by stressing at the first, critical organizational meeting the forceful role of the community in the program in such a way as to scare both teachers and LEA representatives in attendance. This initial suspicion appears to have lingered for at least two years after the project began.

Not only did the SCC operate initially without the full cooperation of teachers and LEA officials, the council appears also to have placed early demands on the nearby university which were beyond the capacity of the institution and its faculty. Consequently, the SCC contracted with an IHE located hundreds of miles away; unfortunately, the quality of the training and courses provided was in many instances less than expected, and it took another 2-3 years before the council re-established a relationship with the closer university which resulted ultimately in much more satisfactory inservice.

What then do we know about the early years of the SCC and the U/R program? The council was comprised (and so remains) primarily of influentials who initially alienated for different reasons teachers, LEA officials and the local IHE ---"nobody was running to become involved with the council" (in the beginning). Having to work within a clearly defined and potentially hostile political system, the council floundered for several years, turning to and using up a succession of four Team Managers, until finally selecting during the past year and a half an administrator who has been a SCC member since its inception. A formalized nomination-election procedure failed to attract a consistent, committed membership, and in the absence of a membership orientation program, the council appears at times to have resembled an unsteady merry-go-round, whirling and teetering to a beckoning tune which drew a steady, narrow stream of ring-seekers as short-term riders but went unheard or was turned-off by most others.

The Programs Developed

Everyone interviewed recognized how fragile a relationship was established by U/R. Most were quick to point out that despite shakey beginnings, somehow a constructive partnership between professionals and community members was maintained, even amid the most tumultuous and sometimes acrimonious periods when either group or even one or two individuals could have easily "torn it all down and sent us home."

Faced with extreme geographic isolation, a high turnover of teachers, poorly achieving students and facilities falling far short of even modest ideal, it made sense that the SCC consolidated its training goals over a five year period so that available resources could be put to a few, critical uses as opposed to diffusing their effects by trying to change the whole world at once.

Basically, the project concentrated on upgrading the qualifications of teachers through advanced degree programs and at the same time worked toward the establishment and promotion of new information and edcuational resource linkages between the school, other institutions and agencies and the community. The radio station, the learning center in the town library, school-sponsored celebrations of local Heritage Days... these served an integrative function and were apparently successful means to build opportunities for people to come together and to share. The influences of the community-school concept and a private national foundation are tangible as they have been translated into places and events which connect people with one another and make available to people institutions and organizations fully capable of serving the diverse needs of an entire community.

The interviewees felt generally that the majority of teachers were pleased with their training. When pressed about why teachers participated in the U/R development programs, several times it was noted that motivation was directly connected to stipends, that teachers suddenly had the opportunity to take courses or receive training without obligation of their own money: as one person put it, "the price was right!". The importance and effectiveness of giving stipends was expressed by nearly all of the interviewees, although several felt rather cynical about the matter, particularly with respect to an unspecified nember of teachers who availed themselves of U/P sponsored or funded inservice, earned advanced degrees while "putting in time in our schools" and then left for positions in nearby, larger cities. Conversely, it was felt by several people that stipends were also the major reason why some community members joined and remained on the SCC. Inescapably evident was a general feeling that the great deal of money which came to the site prompted certain individuals to view the program as a goose which would lay golden eggs on demand. Travel opportunities made available through the program were also discussed as a nagging source of irritation. Most interviewees deflected the criticism and assigned jealousy and ignorance as the reasons why some people took a dim view of sending SCC members and certain teachers on journeys to far away places. It should be noted, however, that two (2) people conceded that perhaps charges of favoritism, personal gain and frivolous travel had some basis in fact.

There is a general feeling that the teachers in the three project schools are dedicated and skilled practitioners who, as a group, benefitted considerably from the training provided --- "We don't have to go very far for talent". Almost without exception it was mentioned that the process for identifying and meeting professional needs became increasingly more sophisticated and precise as the project developed over time. Broad, difficult to interpret surveys gave way to much more dependable project-school assessment techniques administered by School Development Teams. This lead to a relatively more accurate understanding of what teachers needed and wanted in terms of training activities.

The training appears to have been well-balanced between general and specific development activities and programs. While it is clear that the substance of the training was by no means very unusual --- fostering creativity, child development, reading instruction, individualization, etc. --- the delivery and modes of training at times represented a radical departure from what the teachers had been exposed to previously, especially with respect to the traditional inservice provided by the county and the local IHE.

Not only did the SCC eventually establish satisfactory contracts with the university in the area of reality or field-based programs offered at school sites by consultants and education faculty, but the council also seems to have had a direct impact on the county inservice programs as a result of certain teachers becoming trainers in county programs subsequent to their exposure to new ideas and materials both at home and at professional conferences and workshops outside the state. Sending small groups of highly motivated teachers and administrators to extensive, out-of-state training workshops where they had exposure to people, ideas and materials not otherwise available in this rural area appears to have been the most satisfying and effective inservice activity. It was noted several times that some of the early suspicion of the program (U/R) on the parts of teachers and county school officials were reduced as a result of U/R teachers who received quality training and made it their business to spread industriously their newly developed skills and concepts around the county as a whole.

To summarize this section, the project developed several unconventional approaches to the delivery, modes and incentives of inservice which resulted in what are perceived to be effective training programs. The use of short-term IHE consultants brought in on a needs basis and the opportunity for teachers to submit to the SCC mini-proposals funded up to $300, were two of the most frequently mentioned methods for using inservice resources responsively in order to meet the diverse and emergent needs and interests of teachers, especially with respect to making available new curriculum materials and allowing teachers to work on a 1:1 basis with local resource people and outside consultants.

Utilization of Training

Concensus has it that the involvement of teachers in the identification of training needs produced substantially improved inservice in terms of both content and delivery. The provision of stipends, shifting the locale of graduate coursework from the IHE to the public schools (during convenient hours) and the availability of both outside consultants and opportunities to attend regional and national conferences and workshops all appear to have contributed to a fairly high degree of training utilization.

Several interviewees referred to a nucleus of extremely committed teachers, principally at the elementary level and to a lesser extent at the secondary level, who went out of their way to become highly visible, sharing professionals who aided interested colleagues to understand and to implement new ideas and materials acquired through training. The cooperation of project-school administrators was viewed as being critical, particularly in setting the tone of the relationship between professionals and community members. Community members not only had their own workshops, but frequently they were also in attendance at training sessions geared towars teachers' interests and needs related to instruction and curriculum. Opening up the school and classrooms during the day to community members allowed nonprofessionals opportunities to apply their own training, especially parenting skills, as volunteer aids.

The feeling is strongly held that the teachers were given a real chance through inservice to create a better environment in which to work, a need which had to be met in order to reverse the trend and retain teachers for longer periods of time, thereby stabilizing somewhat the school faculties in the smaller communities in the less populous northern end of the county.

The problem of encouraging older teachers, many near retirement, to become involved in U/R inservice programs was not solved satisfactorily, although sitpends did work as an incentive for some. It was suggested by one interviewee that the high school teachers benefitted least from the program because their interests were related to subject matter concerns, and it wasn't really possible to mount more satisfying and effective development activities than those traditionally available through advanced coursework in one's academic discipline. The difficulty in meeting the particular needs of these teachers was interesting, but even more so was the observation made by one individual that several teachers took so many graduate hours through U/R-sponsored coursework that they were for long periods of time unable to to work effectively in their classrooms.

All told, it appears that there is little hard evidence to point to as proof that teachers did in fact utilize their training and will continue to do so. Not using resident professors and not having on the U/R staff full-time consultants were viewed as obstacles to assuring that large numbers of teachers applied their training properly in their classrooms. Generally there was agreement that the SCC tried as best as possible to see that follow-through was provided, but the limitations of relying on the irregular and often hurried services of county and IHE trainers to aid teachers to implement training left it almost exclusively up to teachers and administrators themselves to manage this aspect of inservice education.

SUMMARY

As the Urban/Rural School Development Program neared its final days, six years after it had begun, case studies of individual programs were initiated by the LTI at 6 of the U/R sites (3 urban and 3 rural programs). A total of some 60 participants, representing a variety of U/R role groups, agreed to be interviewed by 4 investigators about their experiences with the program.

The case studies were designed to probe the contribution of the structural and functional parity processes on School-Community Councils to U/R productivity. Responses to the interviews, observations by the investigators, and archival data make up the findings in this document.

LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES

It was reported that even as the program was being considered at the sites, some LEA officials had misgivings about the advisability of applying for U/R funds. The nation was in the throes of widespread discontent and protests about a host of issues. In public education things were not going well at all and in many school districts the public clamored for community control of their schools.

Urban/Rural guidelines mandated that at least one-half of the policy-makers for the program (School-Community Councils) would be made up of community members. From a community point of view, this would seem to offer some relief from unilateral LEA policy making (and give the community at least 50% of its demands).

For their part, given the mood of many large cities at that time, it is not difficult to understand the unsettling effect this proposition had on school authorities. And yet, it did offer a new source of in-service funds and also held the promise of a respite from the radically viewed insistence upon community control.

Even in smaller rural districts where the citizenry was not so vocally obstreperous, this was a fairly big step into the unknown. While it was true that these large amounts of federal monies for "training of school personnel" might well impact upon entire districts (2 or 3 schools), the outcome would be, (1) only partially within the administration's control and (2) highly visible if things went poorly (or well).

Whatever trepidations may have existed, superintendents found ways to allay them, as they placed their signatures on grant proposals and accepted U/R funds from the U.S. Office of Education.* If there was ambivalence in so commiting themselves, they were all destined to become converts. All case study superintendents reported their U/R programs as successes and several were explicit about its areas of contribution.

TEAM MANAGERS

Once funded, SCC's were to hire a team manager as their executive officer who was to be, (1) approved for hiring by the LEA, (2) paid through the LEA payroll office, (3) an employee of the LEA, detailed to the SCC and (4) the primary and chief staff person for the SCC.** These facts rather clearly indicated that team manager loyalty would have to be divided between the LEA and SCC. This implied split in supervision of TM's may have been a nemisis for some of them and seemingly a risk for all programs, although not directly commented upon by respondents.

The dualistic loyalty required of TM's placed them in a precarious position of being co-opted by the LEA or SCC and this may have accounted for the high TM attrition rate. One program had 4 TM's, another 5 and only 2 of the six sites retained their original TM's throughout.

Perhaps a dubious reward for serving as the delegate for both groups, the TM's potential influence on SCC decisions was probably as great or greater than its voting members. Structured as it was, this position surely had the likelyhood of making severe demands upon TM's integrity, credibility and tolerance for ambiguity.

---

*These funds were placed in the local district's budget from which monies could be disbursed for SCC purposes.

**The Team Manager title was derived from a principal function they were to perform in relating to a cadre of teachers in the U/R schools (School Development Team).

In spite of these burdensome requirements, TM's were greatly esteemed by their council members and most of them looked forward to promotions within their school systems at the termination of the U/R programs.

URBAN/RURAL STAFFING VARIATIONS AND FACILITIES

Dramatic differences were evident in the range of U/R facilities, staffing patterns and equipment. More often than not, U/R was headquartered in a school building where modest offices were available for the team manager and secretary. Meeting rooms, workrooms and a variety of reproduction and a/v equipment were made available to the U/R program by the school system as needed. In most instances, U/R budgets could be used to supplement additional or unique equipment which was required.

Then there were programs whose innovations required increases in the U/R staff (e.g. computer specialists, full-time program evaluators, etc.). As well, some of these programs utilized U/R funds for more esoteric and somewhat exotic equipment and services (e.g. surveying equipment, mini-grants to teachers, operating a radio station, computer terminals and monitors, etc.).

One program operated out of a building used exclusively for U/R, had 7 or 8 staff persons, and hired community persons as out-reach workers. The building, in addition to housing U/R offices, served as a center at which U/R and non U/R teachers and community members could meet, hold workshops, and utilize its several resource rooms.

This latter arrangement was seen by its program respondents and concurred in by its investigator as having a homogenizing effect on teachers and community members to a far greater degree than the leaner programs described earlier. The differences in the expansiveness of some programs in contrast to others was thought by the investigators to be a function of, (1) the TM's administrative style, (2) the esteem held for the program by the LEA and (3) the flexibility of the LEA's resources.

SCHOOL-COMMUNITY COUNCIL CHAIRPERSONS

As SCC's were formed, two of their most immediate tasks were to elect a chairperson and develop by-laws which would determine that official's term of office. Considerable autonomy had been mandated to two potentially disparate sub-groups (school professionals and community members) in the form of a policy making council, over which this person would preside. This, and the fact that they had been handed some of the board of education's decision making power, meant that SCC's were probably formidable groups to chair, especially for those with limited or no previous experience.

In two of the urban sites, on investigation, there was no evidence that the chairpersons were recognized by their councils, much less the LEA, as their program's highest ranking official. In observing their manner and interaction, it appeared that these chairpersons had abdicated the top leadership role in defference to assertive team managers (who were treated by their LEA's as if they, in fact, were the senior U/R authority). Some of the respondents at these sites confirmed the accuracy of these observations which led the investigator to conclude that SCC's tended to accept leadership from whichever of these figures actually provided it, irrespective of title. To whatever degree this occurred, with its attendent consequence of blurring the functions of policy making and administration, it elevated TM's to positions of emense power in their programs and in their educational communities. To balance the scale on this issue, there was also no evidence of resistance to this redistribution of authority on the part of these particular SCC's.

TEACHERS

Although one respondent believed that disproportionate benefits accrued to U/R teachers and another took exception to their emphasis on cultural heritage over academics, and early-on, community members at a rural site were said to be severly critical of teachers, respondents' comments indicated teachers to be the role group more unquestionably accepted than any other. Teacher training was clearly the fundamental U/R business at the six sites studied and this generally appeared to be consistent with participant expectations. It should be noted that many of the respondents voicing this view as the programs were winding down, may not have had early U/R experience with which to compare this perception.

At two sites where respondents had been involved with the program since its inception, comments indicated that early expectations were not so uniform and clear. One community is said to have had the expectation that U/R would have a broader community-betterment focus such as "Urban Renewal". Another site began its program with "extremely vocal and contentious community people", who used the SCC as a forum for criticizing teachers.

Teacher motivation for taking part in U/R was often questioned by teachers themselves and occasionally community members ascribed motivation to them. A rather full spectrum of reasons was covered by respondent comments which ranged from self interest in credential acquisition and avoidance of classroom teaching to dedication to their students and improving their contribution to their school communities. While personal gain was identified by some as a causal factor in teacher participation at half of the study sites, this was not the numerically predominate view even at sites where it was asserted.

Whatever materialized as hidden or misunderstood teacher agenda, all of the study sites programatically built their U/R programs solidly around their teachers, through in-service training.

SCC STRUCTURES

A basic difference emerged in the study regarding the composition (and subsequent functioning) of the 6 councils. The memberships of all of the councils included the two required, basic sub-groups, school personnel and community persons in the correct proportions. These sub-groups on some councils however, were noticeably similar to each other, whereas on others, this was not descernably true. For ease of discussion, the more heterogeneous council memberships were arbitrarily labled "ALPHA". The councils where both sub-groups (school professionals and community members) were found to be homogeneous were designated "BETA".

In ALPHA councils the 2 sub-groups, (1) had not necessarily known each other prior to SCC membership, (2) each were from different socio-economic spheres and (3) each had been recruited from clearly differentiated franchised or disenfranchised segments of the local population. On this basis, one rural and the three urban sites were identified as conforming to the ALPHA model.

BETA councils were also made up of school professionals and community members and these two required sub-groups were: (1) said to have "known each other for years" prior to SCC membership and had "known each other in contexts that transcend the SCC", or (2) "well-to-do" and "socially influential". Both sites which conformed to the BETA model were rural.

Including as they did, equal proportions of school staff and non-school persons, ALPHA and BETA councils were both inarguably pluralistic in composition and, as far as that goes, comparable. The study, however, describes significant and consistent differences in ALPHA and BETA in the kinds of persons who made up the non-school or community segment of their councils.

For whatever their respective reasons, BETA sites seem to have selected council members from among their more prominent citizens, known to them through previous activity in the affairs of their communities. ALPHA sites chose to draw from a pool of previously inactive, unknowns, at the lower end of the economic ladder. The study elicited no responses that identified this phenomenon, much less explain it, most likely because no given site would have reason to even contemplate it.

Urbanism and ruralism together with some of the demographic data provide some insights into the ALPHA-BETA differences.* ALPHA school districts were composed of predominately white populations (from 70%-80%) while its U/R schools had

*It should again be noted that of the 6 sites, ALPHA represents 1 rural and 3 urban sites and BETA represents 2 rural sites.

extremely high minority enrollments (from 50-98%). The urban site schools were usually located in areas with equally high minority populations. When urban site planners went looking for "community" people as SCC candidates, it was in the congested neighborhoods surrounding the schools where the minorities and poor were concentrated. It should also be remembered that these were some of the disenfranchised and disgruntled population which on occasion demonstrated its outrage with the performance of its schools. For the U/R planners at urban sites, this was literally where the action was.

Although one of the rural sites certainly was not in a high density neighborhood surrounded by a large minority population (minority population of 30%), it appears as though its high minority school enrollment (50%) was the weathervane characteristic which may have moved it in the direction of ALPHA in selecting community members for its SCC. That is, the extremely high (for U/R, rural programs) minority school enrollment may well have been seen as the most significant factor which should determine the recruitment ground for the (SCC) community membership.

Turning to BETA, the racial majority accounted for 83% and 99.9% of each of their district's populations and roughly the same percentages held for school enrollment. BETA site schools were not located in areas of their communities which were distinguishably poor in contrast to any other area and no large masses of alienated minorities dwelled in the communities surrounding the schools. Thus, when BETA U/R planners went in search of their "community" people, it possibly seemed natural and reasonable to select from the mainstreamers who were active in civic matters and participants in their township's improvement. For the U/R planners at these sites - this was perhaps where the political action would be if, instead, the obscure and passive elements of the district had been recruited.

SCC INTERACTION

Functional parity on councils proved to be an elusive process to document. Taking the two BETA sites first, the problem was conceptual. Theoretically, a parity relationship between a council's professionals and its community members would be desirable, on the presumption that each could contribute to the program their unique interests, insights, information and occasional biases. Although both school staff and community people would have in common student benefit, there would still be important differences between them, and it was through their interactions on those differences that hybrid improvements were to come.

BETA respondents, commenting on functional parity on their councils could, and did assert that, without a doubt, it existed. But, in the absence of a cultural and socio-economic gap between the two principal factions on the councils, their assurances could do little more than confound the parity issue. The homogeneity of BETA council memberships, their responses notwithstanding, did not appear to have significantly redistributed the power relationship between LEA's and their communities. It is difficult to see how the character of these councils would differ markedly from their (and other's) boards of education, as a membership of peers.

Some ALPHA community members and a few teachers recognized that early in their SCC's history, community members were reticent in their interactions with professionals or even among themselves at council meetings. All remembered this to be short-lived and no more than would be expected in a mixed group of educators and inexperienced and less assured neighborhood people. A few other community members perceived that this was a more prolonged feeling of intimidation which they felt.

Most of the SCC memberships interestingly did not perceive either dominance nor recessiveness as characterizing the behavior of staff or community at meetings. There was, however, strong evidence in the case study materials and interviews that indicated that the professionals were benignly myopic in their perceptions of parity and that community persons were cautious in seeking it.

There were sufficient numbers of responses such as, "the community painted him as pro-staff and not as supportive of the community" or, "the community labled her as co-opted by the school" or, "....I've got to respect the board of education", all made by SCC community members, to indicate what they perceived the dangers of outspokenness to be. Not one school staff person in all of the ALPHA sites indicated in their interviews that they perceived that community members were sensitive to this.

In addition to these factors which tended to inhibit functional parity, the study identified 3 others.

- Some teachers stated that they had more confidence in the U/R staff than in the SCC proceedings and therefore sometimes didn't get involved (perhaps the previously mentioned strong role of team managers had some bearing on this).
- A few community persons confessed timidity about even speaking up at SCC meetings, much less entering controversies with staff. (Paying of stipends or hiring SCC members to the U/R staff may have engendered feelings of subordinance among community members.)
- Some community members, although anecdotally describing it, did not recognize their own limited participation at meetings. Some seemed blinded by their obvious pleasure and enthusiasm at merely being included and, in spite of their ages, practically all of the community members at urban sites expressed a lingering and child-like respect for teachers (which presumably began when these adults were students).

Functional parity on ALPHA SCC's was generally perceived by its participants, although a good number of responses indicated it to be rather guarded. But, as respondents described no overt barriers put up by a dominate faction, the degree to which it may have fallen short of the ideal must be credited to a self imposed limitation on the part of individuals.

PRODUCTIVITY

The Urban/Rural School Development Program was an enduring school improvement training program, which offered its local designers and implementors an extended length of time to pursue their self-determined goals. Considerable latitude was provided the grant recipients for regularly reassessing needs and modifying methods of addressing them. The six case study sites presumably began with the same general goal, with SCC energy and federal financing combining on the task.

The studies indicate that it was a given site's identification of needs which made the programs different from each other. All of the site schools needed to be improved but, (1) they did not necessarily have the same problems and, (2) even if two or more sites had a common school problem(s), the diagnosis and prescription for treating them stood a good chance of varying, site to site.

Respondents' descriptions of their programs suggest that U/R participants interpreted how they would initially proceed in solving their problems, in two distinctly different ways. Some SCC's seem to have started with the not unreasonable question of - how can we help our teachers, thereby improving our schools? Others apparently posed the question along the lines of - how can we improve what goes on in our schools?

Urban/Rural was thus to be a teacher education program for some sites, and for others, teacher training was to be the basic ingredient of a more complex mixture. This complexity increased with the size of programs, but size was not singularly the determinant of complexity. Rural sites, with lower numbers of enrollment in their U/R schools, tended to limit their modalities for school improvement to teacher education, later adding some ancillary services. Larger, urban sites, began their programs with a varigated approach to improvement directed at schools and school communities - by schools and their communities. There were, of course, programs which fell in between the differences, bracketed by these programs.

Starting with the smaller and least complex of the programs (rural programs, BETA 1 and BETA 2), it was said about one of them that thanks to U/R, "nearly all of the teachers in the school district now have Masters degrees - a condition which does not exist in neighboring counties". Also, much comment was made about each of these program's development of interesting service delivery mechanisms and mode of instruction innovations. As they were both rural, and consequently isolated, travel to U/R conferences and workshops was elevated to a position of prominence as a social, cultural and professionally broadening experience. Because of its remote location, one of their administrators thought U/R to be a, "very valuable recruitment and retention tool for teachers".

As these programs looked back at their accomplishments over the past 6 years, what of lasting value had been attained which would survive after federal funding, in the post U/R period? Greater numbers of higher credentialed teachers with strengthened skills and experience, broadened by travel, seem to qualify as the most significant product at BETA 1 and 2. Important and workable liaison had been made with specific universities to accomplish this. It is also true that considerable insight was gained into educational delivery systems, teacher incentives, developing attractive modes of instruction, public relations and the like, and some or perhaps all of this knowhow could be put to use in these communities in the future. However, it is difficult to find a statement or implication which would lead to the belief that these are accepted processes, practices and affiliations which were institutionalized into the systems during the program or that any of the developmental gains which came out of inservice training will outlive the U/R program.

Although not contradicting it, but perhaps offsetting this fact is that a significant number of teachers are far better prepared to render service to their students as a result of their U/R experience. Communities, to some degree, were involved in these programs but mention is seldom made of this by respondents and descriptions of their participation are even more scarce. The few instances when this was spoken of, community members seemed to be cast in the role of passive participants (i.e., information was broadcast to them, or entertainments were provided for them, etc.).

BETA programs certainly were not said to be without community programs. But, for example, BETA 1 respondents described an "upward trend in such activities in the last 2 (and final) years". The case studies did not convey much about the level of community participation, enthusiasm or change to indicate other than the benevolent utility of such project components. In view of the fact that BETA's grassroots communities, were at best under represented on its councils, the question would certainly arise as to the origin, insightfulness and goals of their community programming. Or put another way, what effect did ALPHA and BETA council structures have on the community components of their programs.

In reviewing the ALPHA (3 urban and 1 rural) programs, the lessons learned seem to include, but not be limited to, a good deal of the BETA program's teacher education achievements.* In ALPHA, the community, both as SCC members and as U/R participants in other capacities, was a more active advocate and partner to teacher education. Community members as well as teachers improved their skills and, through this one ALPHA community gained entrance into the classroom as instructional aides. At another ALPHA site, community persons, under supervision of U/R staff, prepared elaborate materials for classroom use by teachers and still another trained community persons to provide outreach activities for the U/R schools. Through these and a variety of other schemes, schools were opened up to their communities and, in that process, were rejuvenated by the experience. The involvement of the community did not appear to be of unusual merit simply for its own sake, but rather as it augmented teacher training programs by supporting the teachers' in-school efforts. It was differences in this dynamic interaction of teachers and community with each other and with their schools which stands out as the greatest disparity between ALPHA and BETA.

In the middle range of conceptual complexity among the six programs are one urban (ALPHA 1) and one rural program (ALPHA 4) each of which was aware, early in their histories, of the need for "movement toward humanistic practices in the schools" as a conscious part of their teacher education programs. Somehow the direct and contagious effects of this began to produce "positive changes in attitudes" with regard to racial and ethnic sensitivities, respect between students, teachers and parents and "pride in the site schools". Although not inconsistent with their stated goals, this outcome was looked upon with some surprise by teachers and community persons (SCC and others), and was the most often mentioned accomplishment of U/R by them. It was also their conviction that this climate or school environment would prevail long after the termination of the U/R program.

---

*The reader is referred to the upcoming URSDP monograph: A Report of Training Activities Carried on at the Sites for Teachers, School Administrators, Parents and Community Members.

ALPHA 1, in support of teacher education, chose to utilize the U/R program and funds to experiment with classroom management ideas and alternative teacher-student relationships - with which the school administrators were not only captivated but also possessive. It was because of these kinds of changes and improvements that the administrators forecasted a continuing role for an SCC kind of structure with ALPHA 4's superintendent commenting that the SCC "makes more sense than a host of advisory committees...". ALPHA 1's superintendent, having been much more distrustful of the SCC set-up from the outset, was extremely pleased with having weathered what must have seemed like an impending storm and while not diagraming a future role for the SCC, did seem to recognize both the possibility and advantages of working with the community. It had hardly escaped these administrators that during the course of U/R, (1) their teachers had been provided more responsive students as products of a more humanistic adult adult approach, (2) instruction had been orchestrated such that their teachers had been given the kind of attention required in retraining which teachers believed made a difference in their classrooms, (3) school atmospheres had taken on hopeful colorations and (4) through the breaking up of long standing isolation, a mutually beneficial relationship had come to exist between school personnel and their communities.

Finally then, there remain the two U/R case study programs which, of the six, contain the most complex dynamics between schools and communities. ALPHA 2 and 3 (both urban) structured practically all U/R program components around a core, in-service teacher education program. They seem to have begun with (1) assessments of teacher education needs (2) determinations about how training should be designed, edlivered and conducted and (3) the realization that a unilateral attack on improving their schools through teacher improvement would be insufficient.

Perhaps because they were in large, high density areas, they were forced not only to think big, but also to take a wider view of school improvement. More site schools with higher enrollments were involved and consequently more school staff and greater expanses of community had to be contemplated. For example, 7 schools were involved in ALPHA 3, where its planners set up 7 individual SCC's with each to elect representatives to a joint council. This and other mechanisms were designed to facilitate and maintain communications to and from schools and communities. ALPHA 2 hired community outreach workers as school-community liaison persons and both of these urban programs provided extensive training to community members and teachers to assure the stability and fidelity of these networks of communication.

Separate parallel organizational structures were designed for teachers and community persons which enabled each to sort out their unique concerns and disseminate information. School Development Teams (SDT) of about 10 teachers per school were responsible for imparting to other teachers in their buildings, information, techniques and understandings gleaned through their U/P involvement.* ALPHA 2 maintained an on-going community group which met regularly to deliberate its concerns, was provided technical assistance and resource persons by the U/R program and was the feeder group for ALPHA 2's SCC membership.

Larger and more stratified U/R staffings were required in these programs to work at this level of intensity with communities and schools. Program assistants, full-time evaluators and teaching resources technicians added considerable depth to ALPHA 2 and 3's ability to support their encompassing assault in improving their schools. ALPHA 2's staff was comprised of 7 program persons (4 of whom were currently certified, former teachers) and clerical support staff.

Though interesting, taken individually, these were not outstandingly innovative ideas, structures, and processes. But, cumulatively, they represent significant avenues of penetration into the schools by the community and integrative school-community mechanisms once accomplished were maintained.

---

*It should not be inferred that the previously mentioned sites did not utilize SDT's, but merely that wether or not they did, the interviews elicited few if any comments on the subject.

School personnel were afforded a view of the community previously not available and community activity in and out of school was in the service of teacher support and school improvement.

In looking at long-range possibilities, this latter model of school-community interaction (ALPHA 2 and 3) represented for its participants, an intrinsic value which they believe worthy of permanancy. Many respondents had some difficulty in differentiating between "wanting" to maintain the structures in this model and "believing" that they would be retained. There was no confusion, however, regarding their enthusiasm for working toward this goal.

The superintendent interviewed at one of these sites expressed interest in having a SCC developed for each of his sprawling metropolis' many schools. His state had recently mandated that all public schools maintain parent "advisory" councils and in this superintendent's opinion, better service could be expected from what he had known as "school-community councils". A school board member at this same site saw the value of retaining a school-community council because of his experience with the U/R SCC as a microcosim of schools and their communities where board members could get accurate and detailed information about the status of the larger community' views of its schools.

At the other urban, ALPHA site, considerably before termination of the program, the council had legally incorporated itself, in an effort to carry forth the structures and school improvement activities which U/R began. It is not known to this study, the degree of acceptance or support which may or may not be forthcoming from its LEA.

Here then are 6 Urban/Rural School Development Programs placed along a continuum of degrees of conceptual complexity of programming, all aimed at school improvement and by most respondent's accounts, all successful. In retrospect, program participants stated their beliefs that through the prescribed means of structural and functional parity on school-community councils, activities had been engaged in at their sites, over approximately 6 years, which had attained their self-determined goals. There are no reasons to think otherwise.